arXiv:0907.5332v1 [math.AP] 30 Jul 2009

A METRIC ANALYSIS
OF CRITICAL HAMILTON–JACOBI EQUATIONS
IN THE STATIONARY ERGODIC SETTING

ANDREA DAVINI AND ANTONIO SICONOLFI

Abstract. We adapt the metric approach to the study of stationary ergodic Hamilton–Jacobi equations, for which a notion of admissible random (sub)solution is defined. For any level of the Hamiltonian greater than or equal to a distinguished critical value, we define an intrinsic random semidistance and prove that an asymptotic norm does exist. Taking as source region a suitable class of closed random sets, we show that the Lax formula provides admissible subsolutions. This enables us to relate the degeneracies of the critical stable norm to the existence/nonexistence of exact or approximate critical admissible solutions.

1. Introduction

The main purpose of the paper is to adapt the so–called metric method, which has revealed to be a powerful tool for the analysis of critical Hamilton–Jacobi equations posed on compact spaces, see [5, 10, 17], to the stationary ergodic setting. Loosely speaking, the ergodicity can be viewed as a weaker form of compactness, mostly thanks to some powerful asymptotic results, like Birkhoff and Kingman subadditive Theorems, that we repeatedly employ in our research.

We consider a probability space Ω, on which the action of $\mathbb{R}^N$ gives rise to an N–dimensional ergodic dynamical system, and a random continuous Hamiltonian $H(x,p,\omega)$, which is stationary with respect to such dynamics, and, in addition, convex and coercive in the momentum variable.

We look for *admissible subsolutions* of the corresponding stochastic Hamilton–Jacobi equations at different levels of the Hamiltonians. By this we mean Lipschitz random functions which are almost surely subsolutions either in the *viscosity* sense, or, equivalently, *almost everywhere*, while the term *admissible* refers to the fact that they are stationary or, in a weaker form, that they possess stationary increments and gradient with vanishing mean. Exploiting ergodicity and Birkhoff Theorem, this last property turns out to be equivalent to the almost sure sublinearity at infinity.

Actually, we prove that the infima of the values for which the corresponding equations admit a subsolution of the two types coincide. This quantity is called the *stationary critical value* of H and will be denoted by c. The difference is that, due to lack of stability, the existence of a stationary subsolution to $H(x,Dv,\omega)=c$ can fail already in the one–dimensional setting, see [11], while an Ascoli–type theorem, see Theorem 4.3, adjusted to the random environment, guarantees to find subsolutions of the latter class to the critical equation. For this reason we will use, from now on, the word admissible in the weak sense.

The relevance of the critical value is in the fact that it is the unique level of H for which the corresponding Hamilton–Jacobi equation can have admissible (viscosity) solutions or approximate solutions, see Section 4 for definitions. These objects can be used as exact or approximate correctors in related homogenization procedures implementing the perturbed test function method [13, 14].

Existence and nonexistence issues for exact and approximate solutions are relevant open problems in the field. So far, the setup has been completely clarified only in the one–dimensional case [11], where we proved the existence of approximate or exact correctors, depending on whether 0 belongs or not to the interior of the flat part of the effective Hamiltonian.

What is disappointing, at first sight, about the metric approach in this context, is that it is, in the starting point, purely deterministic, with ω playing just the role of a parameter. We in fact define for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$ an intrinsic semidistance S_a starting from the support function of the a–sublevel of $H(x, \cdot, \omega)$.

It is well known that such a distance is finite if and only if $H(x, Du, \omega) = a$ admits (deterministic) subsolutions. A new critical value, depending on ω, say $c_f(\omega)$, then comes at the surface, corresponding to the minimum a for which the equation admits subsolutions. Because of the measurability properties of the Hamiltonian the map $\omega \mapsto c_f(\omega)$ is a random variable, which is, in addition, almost surely constant by the stationarity of H and the ergodicity assumption. Such a constant will be denoted by c_f and called *free critical value* to distinguish it from c. For the same reasons, S_a is, for $a \geq c_f$, a stochastic semidistance, namely a random variable taking value in the family of semidistances endowed with the local uniform convergence. It is apparent from its very definition that $c_f \leq c$, and strict inequality is possible.

From what previously outlined, it is clear that the intrinsic distances S_a cannot be useful *per se* to our analysis, in particular the critical level cannot be detected through the appearance of some degeneracies of the corresponding intrinsic random distance, like in the compact setting. As a matter of fact, such kind of phenomena do not take place, in general, even when $a < c$. Some other steps should therefore be accomplished.

We basically follow two ways: first, we perform an asymptotic analysis of intrinsic distances showing that corresponding (deterministic) *stable norms*, say ϕ_a, do exist for any $a \geq c_f$ and enjoy some relevant properties; secondly, we generalize Lax–type formulae to the stochastic environment providing a class of admissible subsolutions. Through the interplay of these lines of investigation, we establish in the end some of our main results.

To show that there is a stable norm, even in the deterministic case, some kind of subadditive principle is needed, see for instance [3]. Here we use Kingman's Subadditive Ergodic Theorem and mimic the proof given in [22, 23] for the existence of an *effective* (homogenized) *Hamiltonian*. The stable norms ϕ_a are of Minkowski type, possibly degenerate; we actually prove that the critical value is the infimum of the a for which ϕ_a is nondegenerate.

Such norms, being convex and positively homogeneous, are the support functions of some compact convex sets which can be interpreted as the associate dual unit balls. We show that they coincide with the corresponding sublevels of the effective Hamiltonian, denoted by $\overline{H}$. In this manner we provide a new simpler proof of a result already established in [20] through PDE techniques, namely that the effective Hamiltonian coincides with the function associating with any $P \in \mathbb{R}^N$ the stationary critical value of the Hamiltonian $H(x, P + p, \omega)$, see Theorem 6.5. Moreover we show that the free critical value is the minimum of $\overline{H}$; an analogous result have been obtained in [16] for Hamiltonians defined in unbounded spaces and enjoying some form of symmetry.

Regarding the Lax formula, we recall that for any fixed ω a class of fundamental subsolutions to $H(x, Du, \omega) = a$ is built up by

$$\inf\{g(y) + S_a(y, x, \omega) \,:\, y \in C\},$$

where C is a closed subset and g a function defined on it which is 1–Lipschitz continuous with respect to S_a. These kinds of functions are, in addition, solutions outside C. To get through this pattern *admissible* subsolutions, appropriate conditions have to be assumed on the source set, which depends on ω, as well as on the trace, linking them to the stationary ergodic structure.

The key idea, already exploited in [11], is to borrow some tools from stochastic geometry (see [21] for a comprehensive treatment of this topic), and to take as source region a stationary closed random set. That is to say a random variable taking values in the family of closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^N$ endowed with the Fell topology which, in addition, satisfies a compatibility property with the ergodic dynamics, see (2).

With this choice the Lax formula gives an admissible subsolution for any stationary Lipschitz random function g, provided it takes finite values, see Proposition 4.8. This latter condition is always fullfilled when g is itself an admissible subsolution, see Proposition 4.9. In this instance, the more delicate item to prove is that the function so obtained is sublinear at infinity, and for this scope it is essential the asymptotic formula for random closed stationary sets which, in turn, relies upon Birkhoff Theorem.

We use the information gathered to investigate on the existence of exact correctors when $c = c_f$. At this level, some degeneracies of the intrinsic semidistance may appear. The collection of points around which the latter fails to be equivalent to the Euclidean one form the classical *Aubry set* $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$, which, in this setting, turns out to be closed random and stationary. Thus, when it is almost surely nonempty, $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$ can be used as source region in the Lax formula to construct an exact corrector. If, on the contrary, it is almost surely empty and, in addition, the stable norm ϕ_c is nondegenerate, in other terms if no metric degeneracies take place at finite points or at infinity, then no correctors can exist, see Theorem 6.6. Note that all known counterexamples to the existence of correctors are in this frame.

When $c = c_f$ and the latter agrees with $\sup_x \inf_p H(x, p, \omega)$ almost surely, we also prove that approximate correctors can be constructed, always exploiting Lax formula, by taking as source region the set of δ–approximate equilibria, see Proposition 6.7. It should be interesting to prove or disprove that such a property holds true whenever $c = c_f$

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we fix notations and expose some preliminary material. In Section 3 we introduce two different definitions of measurability for set–valued variables and the notion of stationarity; further we describe the main properties of the class of admissible random functions. Some proofs are postponed to the Appendix. Section 4 is focused on stochastic Hamilton–Jacobi equations and Lax formulae. In Section 5 we show the existence of the stable norms associated with the intrinsic distances and we study their connection with the effective Hamiltonian. Section 6 is devoted to statements and proofs of our final results, and ends with an example showing up some major differences with the one–dimensional setting.

Acknowledgements. – The first author has been supported for this research by the European Commission through a Marie Curie Intra–European Fellowship, Sixth Framework Program (Contract MEIF-CT-2006-040267). He wishes to thank Albert Fathi for many interesting discussions and suggestions.

2. Preliminaries

We write below a list of symbols used throughout this paper.

N	an integer number
$B_R(x_0)$	the closed ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$ centered at x_0 of radius R
B_R	the closed ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$ centered at 0 of radius R
$\langle \cdot\, , \cdot \rangle$	the scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^N$
$\lvert \cdot \rvert$	the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^N$
$\mathbb{R}_+$	the set of nonnegative real numbers
$\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$	the σ–algebra of Borel subsets of $\mathbb{R}^N$
χ_E	the characteristic function of the set E

Given a subset U of $\mathbb{R}^N$, we denote by $\overline{U}$ its closure. We furthermore say that U is *compactly contained* in a subset V of $\mathbb{R}^N$ if $\overline{U}$ is compact and contained in V. If E is a Lebesgue measurable subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, we denote by $|E|$ its N–dimensional Lebesgue measure, and qualify E as *negligible* whenever $|E| = 0$. We say that a property holds *almost everywhere* (*a.e.* for short) on $\mathbb{R}^N$ if it holds up to a negligible set. We will write $\varphi_n \rightrightarrows \varphi$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$ to mean that the sequence of functions $(\varphi_n)_n$ uniformly converges to φ on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^N$.

With the term *curve*, without any further specification, we refer to a Lipschitz–continuous function from some given interval $[a, b]$ to $\mathbb{R}^N$. The space of all such curves is denoted by $\mathrm{Lip}([a, b], \mathbb{R}^N)$, while $\mathrm{Lip}_{x,y}([a, b], \mathbb{R}^N)$ stands for the family of curves γ joining x to y, i.e. such that $\gamma(a) = x$ and $\gamma(b) = y$, for any fixed x, y in $\mathbb{R}^N$. We denote by $W^{1,1}([a, b], \mathbb{R}^N)$ the space of absolutely continuous curves defined in $[a, b]$. Given a curve γ defined on some interval $[a, b]$, a curve γ' defined on $[a', b']$ will be called a *reparametrization of* γ if there exists an order preserving Lipschitz–continuous map $f : [a', b'] \to [a, b]$ surjective and such that $\gamma' = \gamma \circ f$. The Euclidean length of a curve γ is denoted by $\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma)$.

For a measurable function $g : I \to \mathbb{R}^N$, $\|g\|_\infty$ stands for $\sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N \|g_i\|^2_{L^\infty(I)}}$, where g_i and $\|g_i\|_{L^\infty(I)}$ denotes the i–th component of g and the L^∞–norm of g_i respectively.

Throughout the paper, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ will denote a *probability space*, where $\mathbb{P}$ is the probability measure and $\mathcal{F}$ the σ–algebra of $\mathbb{P}$–measurable sets. A property will be said to hold *almost surely* (*a.s.* for short) in ω if it holds up to a subset of probability 0. We will indicate by $L^p(\Omega)$, $p \geq 1$, the usual Lebesgue space on Ω with respect to $\mathbb{P}$. If $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, we write $\mathbb{E}(f)$ for the mean of f on Ω, i.e. the quantity $\int_\Omega f(\omega)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(\omega)$.

We qualify as *measurable* a map from Ω to itself, or to a topological space $\mathcal{M}$ with Borel σ–algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M})$, if the inverse image of any set in $\mathcal{F}$ or in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M})$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}$. This object will be also called *random variable* with values in $\mathcal{M}$.

We will be particulary interested in the case where the range of a random variable is a *Polish* space, namely a complete and separable metric space. By $\mathrm{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\mathrm{Lip}_\kappa(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we will denote the Polish space of continuous and Lipschitz–continuous real functions, with Lipschitz constant less than or equal to $\kappa > 0$, defined in $\mathbb{R}^N$, both endowed with the metric of the uniform convergence on compact subsets of

$\mathbb{R}^N$. We will use the expressions *continuous random function*, *κ–Lipschitz random function*, respectively, for the previously introduced random variables. Actually, we will usually omit κ and simply write *Lipschitz random function.* The following characterization of random continuous functions holds, see [11]

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\omega \mapsto v(\cdot, \omega)$ be a map from Ω to $\mathrm{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. The following are equivalent facts:*

(i) *v is a random continuous function;*

(ii) *for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the map $\omega \mapsto v(x, \omega)$ is measurable in Ω;*

(iii) *the map $(x, \omega) \mapsto v(x, \omega)$ is jointly measurable in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$, i.e. measurable with respect to the product σ–algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^N) \otimes \mathcal{F}$.*

Throughout the paper $(\tau_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N}$ will denote a *N–dimensional dynamical system*, defined as a family of mappings $\tau_x : \Omega \to \Omega$ which satisfy the following properties:

(1) the *group property:* $\tau_0 = id, \quad \tau_{x+y} = \tau_x \circ \tau_y$;
(2) the mappings $\tau_x : \Omega \to \Omega$ are measurable and measure preserving, i.e. $\mathbb{P}(\tau_x E) = \mathbb{P}(E)$ for every $E \in \mathcal{F}$;
(3) the map $(x, \omega) \mapsto \tau_x\omega$ from $\mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$ to Ω is jointly measurable, i.e. measurable with respect to the product σ–algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^N) \otimes \mathcal{F}$.

We will moreover assume that $(\tau_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N}$ is *ergodic,* i.e. that one of the following equivalent conditions hold:

(i) every measurable function f defined on Ω such that, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $f(\tau_x\omega) = f(\omega)$ a.s. in Ω, is almost surely constant;
(ii) every set $A \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\tau_x A \,\Delta\, A) = 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ has probability either 0 or 1, where Δ stands for the symmetric difference.

Notice that for any vector subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $(\tau_x)_{x\in V}$ is still a dynamical system on Ω, but ergodicity does not hold in general.

Given a random variable $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, for any fixed $\omega \in \Omega$ the function $x \mapsto f(\tau_x\omega)$ is said to be a *realization of f*. The following properties follow from Fubini's Theorem, see [18]: if $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, then $\mathbb{P}$–almost all its realizations belong to $L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$; if $f_n \to f$ in $L^p(\Omega)$, then $\mathbb{P}$–almost all realizations of f_n converge to the corresponding realization of f in $L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. The Lebesgue spaces on $\mathbb{R}^N$ are understood with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

The next lemma guarantees that a modification of a random variable on a set of zero probability does not affect its realizations on sets of positive Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^N$, almost surely in ω. The proof is based on Fubini's Theorem again, see Lemma 7.1 in [18].

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\widehat{\Omega}$ be a set of full measure in Ω. Then there exists a set of full measure $\Omega' \subseteq \widehat{\Omega}$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega'$ we have $\tau_x\omega \in \widehat{\Omega}$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$.*

Next we state the Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem for ergodic N–dimensional dynamical systems. It establishes a relation between statistical and spatial means.

Theorem 2.3 (**Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem**)**.** *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and $(\tau_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N}$ a group of translations as above. Then, for any $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, the limit*

$$f^*(\omega) = \lim_{t\to+\infty} \fint_{tE} f(\tau_x\omega)\,\mathrm{d}x$$

exists and is invariant with respect to $(\tau_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N}$ *a.s. in* ω, *where* E *is any Borel subset of* $\mathbb{R}^N$ *with* $|E| > 0$. *Moreover* $\mathbb{E}(f^*) = \mathbb{E}(f)$. *If, in addition,* $(\tau_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N}$ *is ergodic, then* $f^*(\omega) = \mathbb{E}(f)$ *a.s. in* ω.

We will also need the following subadditive ergodic theorem.

Theorem 2.4 (Kingman's Subadditive Ergodic Theorem). *Let* $\{f_{m,n} : 0 \le m \le n\}$ *be random variables which satisfy the following properties:*

(a) $f_{0,0} = 0$ *and* $f_{m,n} \le f_{m,k} + f_{k,m}$ *for every* $m \le k \le n$;

(b) $\{f_{m,m+k} : m \ge 0,\, k \ge 0\}$ *have the same distribution law than* $\{f_{m+1,m+k+1} : m \ge 0,\, k \ge 0\}$, *i.e. for every* $0 \le m_1 < \cdots < m_n$, $0 \le k_1 < \cdots < k_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{i=1}^n f^{-1}_{m_1,m_1+k_1}(A_i)\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{i=1}^n f^{-1}_{m_1+1,m_1+k_1+1}(A_i)\right)$$

for any open subset A_i *of* $\mathbb{R}$;

(c) $\int_\Omega (f_{0,1}(\omega))^+ \, d\mathbb{P}(\omega) < +\infty$.

Then the following holds:

(i) $\mu := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_\Omega f_{0,n}(\omega)\, d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} \int_\Omega f_{0,n}(\omega)\, d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \in [-\infty, +\infty)$;

(ii) $f_\infty(\omega) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f_{0,n}(\omega)}{n}$ *exists for* $\mathbb{P}$*–almost every* $\omega \in \Omega$;

(iii) $\int_\Omega f_\infty(\omega)\, d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \mu$ *and, if* $\mu > -\infty$, *then*

$$\frac{f_{0,n}}{n} \to f_\infty \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega).$$

3. Stationary Random Variables

In this section we recall the notion of stationarity for random functions and random sets. These objects are of crucial relevance for the extension of Lax–type formulae to the stationary ergodic setting, see Propositions 4.8 and 4.9. Then we will proceed to give the definition and to study the properties of Lipschitz random functions with stationary increments. Some of these results have been already proved in [11] for $N = 1$. Their generalization to higher dimensions is more subtle and requires additional tools, whose presentation has been postponed to the Appendix, as well as those proofs that on such tools are based, i.e. Theorems 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9.

A jointly measurable function v defined in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$ is said *stationary* if, for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, there exists a set Ω_z with probability 1 such that for every $\omega \in \Omega_z$

$$v(\cdot + z, \omega) = v(\cdot, \tau_z\omega) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^N$$

It is clear that a real random variable ϕ gives rise to a stationary function v by setting $v(x,\omega) = \phi(\tau_x\omega)$. Conversely, according to Proposition 3.1 in [11], a stationary function v is, a.s. in ω, the realization of the measurable function $\omega \mapsto v(0,\omega)$. More precisely, there exists a set Ω' of probability 1 such that for every $\omega \in \Omega'$

$$v(x,\omega) = v(0,\tau_x\omega) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{1}$$

With the term *(graph–measurable) random set* we indicate a set–valued function $X : \Omega \to \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with

$$\Gamma(X) := \left\{(x,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega \,:\, x \in X(\omega)\right\}$$

jointly measurable in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$. A random set X will be qualified as *stationary* if for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, there exists a set Ω_z of probability 1 such that

$$X(\tau_z \omega) = X(\omega) - z \qquad \text{for every } \omega \in \Omega_z. \tag{2}$$

We use a stronger notion of measurability, which is usually named in the literature after Effros, to define a *closed random set*, say $X(\omega)$. Namely we require $X(\omega)$ to be a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ for any ω and

$$\{\omega \, : \, X(\omega) \cap K \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{F}$$

with K varying among the compact (equivalently, open) subsets of $\mathbb{R}^N$. This condition can be analogously expressed by saying that X is measurable with respect to the Borel σ–algebra related to the Fell topology on the family of closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^N$. This, in turn, coincides with the Effros σ–algebra. If $X(\omega)$ is measurable in this sense then it is also graph–measurable, see [21] for more details.

A closed random set X is called stationary if it, in addition, satisfies (2). Note that in this event the set $\{\omega \, : \, X(\omega) \neq \emptyset\}$, which is measurable by the Effros measurability of X, is invariant with respect to the group of translations $(\tau_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N}$ by stationarity, so it has probability either 0 or 1 by the ergodicity assumption.

A convenient way to produce random closed (stationary) sets in $\mathbb{R}^N$ is indicated by the next result, see [11] for a proof.

Proposition 3.1. *Let f be a continuous random function and C a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$X(\omega) := \{x \, : \, f(x,\omega) \in C\}$$

is a closed random set in $\mathbb{R}^N$. If in addition f is stationary, then X is stationary.

For a random stationary set X is immediate, by exploiting that the maps $\{\tau_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N}$ are measure preserving, that $\mathbb{P}(X^{-1}(x))$ does not depend on x, where

$$X^{-1}(x) = \{\omega \, : \, x \in X(\omega)\}.$$

Such quantity will be called *volume fraction* of X and denoted by q_X. Note that to any measurable subset Ω' of Ω it can be associated a stationary set Y through the formula

$$Y(\omega) := \{x \, : \, \tau_x \omega \in \Omega'\}.$$

In this case $Y^{-1}(x) = \tau_{-x}\Omega'$, and so $q_Y = \mathbb{P}(\Omega')$.

The following classical result, which can be obtained as a direct application of Fubini's theorem, will play a relevant role in what follows, see [21].

Theorem 3.2 (**Robbins' Theorem**). *Let X be a random set in $\mathbb{R}^N$. If μ is a locally finite measure on Borel sets, then $\mu(X)$ is a random variable and*

$$\int_\Omega \mu(X(\omega)) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathbb{P}(X^{-1}(x)) \, \mathrm{d}\mu,$$

in the sense that if one side is finite, then so is the other and they are equal.

We next exploit the ergodicity assumption to get, through the Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem, an interesting information on the asymptotic structure of stationary sets, yielding in particular that stationary sets are spread with some uniformity in the space. We refer the reader to [11] for the proof.

Proposition 3.3. *Let X be an almost surely nonempty closed stationary set in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $R_\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{r \to +\infty} \frac{|(X(\omega) + B_R) \cap B_r|}{|B_r|} \geq 1 - \varepsilon \qquad a.s. \ in \ \Omega,$$

whenever $R \geq R_\varepsilon$.

Given a Lipschitz random function v, we set

$$\Delta_v(\omega) := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N \, : \, v(\cdot, \omega) \text{ is differentiable at } x \right\}.$$

Definition 3.4. A random Lipschitz function v is said to have *stationary increments* if, for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, there exists a set Ω_z of probability 1 such that

$$v(x+z,\omega) - v(y+z,\omega) = v(x, \tau_z\omega) - v(y, \tau_z \omega) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$$

for every $\omega \in \Omega_z$.

The following holds:

Proposition 3.5. *Let v be a Lipschitz random function, then Δ_v is a random set. In addition, it is stationary with volume fraction* 1 *whenever v has stationary increments.*

Proof. The property of Δ_v of being a random set can be proved via standard measure theoretic arguments, see for instance Lemma 2.5 in [15] for a short proof. If v has stationary increments then, for any fixed $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$v(\cdot + z, \omega) - v(\cdot, \tau_z \omega) \quad \text{is constant on } \mathbb{R}^N$$

whenever ω belongs to some set Ω_z with probability 1. This implies that $x + z$ is a differentiability point for $v(\cdot, \omega)$ if and only if x is a differentiability point for $v(\cdot, \tau_z\omega)$, which, in turn, means that Δ_v is a stationary. Since $\Delta_v(\omega)$ has full measure in $\mathbb{R}^N$ for every ω by Rademacher's Theorem, Robbin's Theorem with μ equal the Lebesgue measure restricted to some ball of $\mathbb{R}^N$ readily implies that it volume fraction is equal to 1. $\square$

Next, we state an important stability result for random functions with stationary increments which are equiLipschitz, i.e. that all take values in $\mathrm{Lip}_\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for some fixed $\kappa > 0$.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $(v_n)_n$ be an equiLipschitz sequence of random functions with stationary increments. Then there exist a random Lipschitz function v with stationary increments, a sequence $w_k = \sum_{n \geq n_k} \lambda_n^k v_n$ of finite convex combinations of the v_n and a sequence g_k of real random variables such that*

$$w_k(\cdot, \omega) + g_k(\omega) \rightrightarrows v(\cdot, \omega) \quad a.s. \ in \ \omega.$$

In addition the sequence of indices $(n_k)_k$ can be taken diverging.

Let v be a Lipschitz random function with stationary gradient. For every fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the random variable $Dv(x, \cdot)$ is well defined on $\Delta_v^{-1}(x)$, which has probability 1 since Δ_v is a stationary set with volume fraction 1. Accordingly, we can define the mean $\mathbb{E}(Dv(x, \cdot))$, which is furthermore independent of x, see Proposition A.4–*(i)*. In the sequel, we will be especially interested in the case when this mean is zero.

Definition 3.7. A Lipschitz random function will be called *admissible* if it has stationary increments and gradient with mean 0.

We state two characterizations of admissible random functions.

Theorem 3.8. *A Lipschitz random function v with stationary increments has gradient with vanishing mean if and only if it is almost surely sublinear at infinity, namely*

$$\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} \frac{v(x,\omega)}{|x|} = 0 \qquad \textit{a.s. in } \omega. \tag{3}$$

Theorem 3.9. *A Lipschitz random function v with stationary increments has gradient with vanishing mean if and only if*

$$x \mapsto \mathbb{E}(v(y,\cdot) - v(x,\cdot)) = 0 \quad \textit{for any } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{4}$$

Finally, we show that any stationary Lipschitz random function is admissible. Notice that in this case $\mathbb{E}(v(x,\cdot))$ is independent of x, so when such a quantity is finite this is just a consequence of Theorem 3.9.

Theorem 3.10. *Any stationary Lipschitz random function v is admissible.*

Proof. Clearly, a stationary Lipschitz random function has stationary increments. To prove the assertion, it is therefore enough to show that $v(\cdot,\omega)$ is almost surely sublinear at infinity, in view of Theorem 3.8. Let κ be a Lipschitz constant for $v(\cdot,\omega)$ for every ω. The stationary character of v means, cf. (1), that for any ω in a set of probability 1

$$v(x,\omega) = v(0,\tau_x\omega) \qquad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

We claim that there exists a constant M such that $E := \{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, |v(0,\omega)| \le M\}$ has positive probability. Indeed, if this were not the case, we would have that $E_\infty := \{\omega \,:\, |v(0,\omega)| = +\infty\}$ has probability 1. An application of Robbins' Theorem with $\mu = \mathcal{L}^N \llcorner B_r$ for every fixed $r > 0$ would imply that the stationary random set

$$F_\infty(\omega) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \,:\, \tau_x\omega \in E_\infty,\ v(x,\omega) = v(0,\tau_x\omega)\}$$

is of full measure in $\mathbb{R}^N$ a.s. in ω, yielding $v(\cdot,\omega) \equiv +\infty$ a.s. in ω, a contradiction.

Let us fix M such that E has positive probability. Then the closed stationary random set

$$C(\omega) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \,:\, |v(x,\omega)| \le M\}$$

is almost surely nonempty. Accordingly, by Proposition 3.3 there exists a set Ω_0 probability 1 such that, for every $\omega \in \Omega_0$,

$$\lim_{r\to+\infty} \frac{|\,(C(\omega) + B_n) \cap B_r|}{|B_r|} > 1 - \varepsilon_n,$$

where $(\varepsilon_n)_n$ is a sequence decreasing to 0. Fix $\omega \in \Omega_0$. Then for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $|x|$ large enough, we have

$$|\,(C(\omega) + B_n) \cap B_{2|x|}| > (1 - \varepsilon_n)\,|B_{2|x|}|.$$

For n sufficiently large $B_{2|x|(\varepsilon_n)^{1/N}}(x) \subseteq B_{2|x|}$, and from the above inequality we infer

$$B_{2|x|(\varepsilon_n)^{1/N}}(x) \cap (C(\omega) + B_n) \neq \emptyset,$$

i.e. there exists $y = y(x,n)$ in $C(\omega)$ such that $|y-x| < 2|x|(\varepsilon_n)^{1/N} + n$. Since $|v(y,\omega)| \leq M$, we get

$$|v(x,\omega)| \leq |v(x,\omega) - v(y,\omega)| + |v(y,\omega)| \leq \kappa \left(2|x|(\varepsilon_n)^{1/N} + n\right) + M.$$

From this we obtain

$$\limsup_{|x|\to+\infty} \frac{|v(x,\omega)|}{|x|} \leq 2\kappa\,(\varepsilon_n)^{1/N},$$

and the claim follows letting $n \to +\infty$. □

4. STOCHASTIC HAMILTON–JACOBI EQUATIONS

We consider an Hamiltonian

$$H : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$$

satisfying the following conditions:

(H1) the map $\omega \mapsto H(\cdot,\cdot,\omega)$ from Ω to the Polish space $C(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N)$ is measurable;

(H2) for every $(x,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$, $H(x,\cdot,\omega)$ is convex on $\mathbb{R}^N$;

(H3) there exist two superlinear functions $\alpha, \beta : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\alpha(|p|) \leq H(x,p,\omega) \leq \beta(|p|) \qquad \text{for all } (x,p,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega;$$

(H4) for every $(x,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$, the set of minimizers of $H(x,\cdot,\omega)$ has empty interior;

(H5) $H(\cdot + z, \cdot, \omega) = H(\cdot,\cdot,\tau_z\omega)$ for every $(z,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$.

Remark 4.1. Condition (H3) is equivalent to saying that H is superlinear and locally bounded in p, uniformly with respect to (x,ω). We deduce from (H2)

$$|H(x,p,\omega) - H(x,q,\omega)| \leq L_R|p-q| \quad \text{for all } x,\ \omega, \text{ and } p,\ q \text{ in } B_R, \tag{5}$$

where $L_R = \sup\{\, |H(x,p,\omega)| \,:\, (x.\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega,\ |p| \leq R+2 \,\}$, which is finite thanks to (H3). For a comment on hypothesis (H4), see Remark 4.7.

Remark 4.2. Any given periodic, quasi–periodic or almost–periodic Hamiltonian $H_0 : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ can be seen as a specific realization of a suitably defined stationary ergodic Hamiltonian, cf. Remark 4.2 in [11].

For every $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we are interested in the stochastic Hamilton–Jacobi equation

$$H(x, Dv(x,\omega), \omega) = a \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{6}$$

The analysis performed on it in [11] stays valid in the present multidimensional setting, with minor adjustments. We basically refer to it, just recalling the main items and pointing out the main differences.

We say that a Lipschitz random function is a *solution* (resp. *subsolution*) of (6) if it is a viscosity solution (resp. a.e. subsolution) a.s. in ω (see [1, 2] for the definition of viscosity (sub)solution in the deterministic case). Notice that any such subsolution takes value in $\mathrm{Lip}_{\kappa_a}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where

$$\kappa_a := \sup\{\, |p| \,:\, H(x,p,\omega) \leq a \text{ for some } (x,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega \,\},$$

and this quantity is finite thanks to (H3). We are interested in the class of *admissible subsolutions*, hereafter denoted by $\mathcal{S}_a$, i.e. random functions with stationary increments and zero mean gradient that are subsolutions of (6). An admissible solution will be also named *exact corrector*, remembering its role in homogenization. Further, for any $\delta > 0$, a random function v_δ will be called a δ*–approximate corrector* for the equation (6) if it belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{a+\delta}$ and satisfies the inequalities

$$a - \delta \leq H(x, Dv_\delta(x,\omega), \omega) \leq a + \delta \tag{7}$$

in the viscosity sense a.s. in ω. We say that (6) has *approximate correctors* if it admits δ–approximate correctors for any $\delta > 0$.

The following stability property of admissible subsolutions is a consequence of Theorem 3.6 along with the remark that, if in the convergence established there the approximating random functions are admissible, the limit too keeps this property. The proof is analogous to that of Theorem 4.3 in [11].

Theorem 4.3. *Let $(a_n)_n$ be a sequence of real numbers and v_n a random function in $\mathcal{S}_{a_n}$ for each n. If a_n converges to some a, there exist $v \in \mathcal{S}_a$ and a sequence $(w_k)_k$ made up by finite convex combinations of the v_n, up to an additive real random variable, such that*

$$w_k(\cdot, \omega) \rightrightarrows v(\cdot, \omega) \quad \text{a.s. in } \omega.$$

We proceed by defining the *free* and the *stationary critical value*, denoted by $c_f(\omega)$ and c respectively, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \inf\{a \in \mathbb{R} \,:\, \mathcal{S}_a \neq \emptyset\}, && (8)\\ c_f(\omega) &= \inf\left\{a \in \mathbb{R} \,:\, (6) \text{ has a subsolution } v \in \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^N)\right\}. && (9) \end{aligned}$$

We emphasize that in definition (9) we are considering *deterministic* a.e. subsolutions v of the equation (6), where ω is treated as a fixed parameter. The set appearing at the right–hand side of (8) is non void, since it contains the value $\sup_{(x,\omega)} H(x, 0, \omega)$, which is finite thanks to (H3). Furthermore, notice that $c_f(\tau_z\omega) = c_f(\omega)$ for every $(z, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$, so that, by ergodicity, the random variable $c_f(\omega)$ is almost surely equal to a constant, still denoted by c_f. Hereafter we will write Ω_f for the set of probability 1 where $c_f(\omega)$ is equal to c_f. It is apparent that $c \geq c_f$.

In what follows, we mostly focus our attention on the *critical equation*

$$H(x, Dv(x,\omega), \omega) = c \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{10}$$

It follows from Theorem 4.3 that it admits admissible subsolutions, i.e. $\mathcal{S}_c \neq \emptyset$. The relevance of the critical value c is given by the following result, see Theorem 4.5 in [11] for the proof.

Theorem 4.4. *The critical equation* (10) *is the unique among equations* (6) *either an exact corrector or approximate correctors may exist.*

We introduce an intrinsic path distance, assuming in next formulae $a \geq c_f$ and $\omega \in \Omega_f$. We start by defining the sublevels

$$Z_a(x,\omega) := \{p \,:\, H(x,p,\omega) \leq a\},$$

and the related support functions $\sigma_a(x,q,\omega)$ by

$$\sigma_a(x,q,\omega) := \sup\{\langle q, p\rangle \,:\, p \in Z_a(x,\omega)\}.$$

It comes from (5) (cf. Lemma 4.6 in [11]) that, given $b > a$, we can find $\delta = \delta(b,a) > 0$ with

$$Z_a(x,\omega) + B_\delta \subseteq Z_b(x,\omega) \qquad \text{for every } (x,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega_f. \tag{11}$$

This property is used in the proof of Theorems 5.1 and 5.3. It is also needed in the proof of Theorem 4.4. It is straightforward to check that σ_a is convex in q, upper semicontinuous in x and, in addition, continuous whenever $Z_a(x,\omega)$ has nonempty interior or reduces to a point. We extend the definition of σ_a to $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$ by setting $\sigma_a(\cdot,\cdot,\omega) \equiv 0$ for every $\omega \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_f$. With this choice, the function σ_a is jointly measurable in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$ and enjoys the stationarity property

$$\sigma_a(\cdot + z, \cdot, \omega) = \sigma_a(\cdot,\cdot,\tau_z\omega) \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and } \omega \in \Omega.$$

Next, for every $a \geq c_f$, we define the semidistance S_a as

$$S_a(x,y,\omega) = \inf\left\{ \int_0^1 \sigma_a(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s),\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s \,:\, \gamma \in \mathrm{Lip}_{x,y}([0,1],\mathbb{R}^N) \right\}. \tag{12}$$

The function S_a is measurable on $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$ with respect to the product σ–algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^N) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^N) \otimes \mathcal{F}$, and satisfies the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} S_a(x,y,\tau_z\omega) &= S(x+z,y+z,\omega) \\ S_a(x,y,\omega) &\leq S_a(x,z,\omega) + S_a(z,y,\omega) \\ S_a(x,y,\omega) &\leq \kappa_a|x-y| \end{aligned}$$

for all $x,y,z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. According to Proposition 3.1, S_a is a random (semi)distance, i.e. a random variable taking values in the space of semidistances endowed with the local uniform convergence in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$. We have (see [17]):

Proposition 4.5. *Let $a \geq c_f$ and $\omega \in \Omega_f$.*

(i) For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the functions $S_a(y,\cdot,\omega)$ and $-S_a(\cdot,y,\omega)$ are both subsolutions of (6).

(ii) A continuous function ϕ is a subsolution of (6) if and only if

$$\phi(x) - \phi(y) \leq S_a(y,x,\omega) \qquad \text{for all } x,y \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

An immediate consequence of the previous item (ii) is that for any cycle γ defined in $[0,1]$ $\int_0^1 \sigma_a(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s),\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s \geq 0$, whenever $a \geq c_f$. We define for every $\omega \in \Omega$ the *classical (projected) Aubry set* (cf. [17]), which plays a special role in the study of equation (6) with $a = c_f$, as the collection of points $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that there is a sequence of cycles γ_n, defined in $[0,1]$ and based on y, with

$$\inf_n \int_0^1 \sigma_{c_f}(\gamma_n,\dot\gamma_n,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_n \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_n) > 0$$

or, equivalently (cf. [17, Lemma 5.1]),

$$\inf\left\{ \int_0^1 \sigma_{c_f}(\gamma,\dot\gamma,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s \,:\, \gamma \in \mathrm{Lip}_{y,y}([0,1],\mathbb{R}^N),\, \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma) \geq \delta \right\} = 0 \quad \text{for any } \delta > 0.$$

Hereafter we will denote by $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$ the collection of points y of $\mathbb{R}^N$ enjoying one of the two equivalent conditions above. It is closed for every $\omega \in \Omega$. Given $\omega \in \Omega_f$, $a \geq c_f$, and a closed subset C of $\mathbb{R}^N$, a standard way for producing a subsolution of (6) is by means of the following Lax formula

$$\inf\{w_0(y) + S_a(y,x,\omega) \,:\, y \in C\}, \tag{13}$$

where w_0 is a function defined on C which is 1 Lipschitz–continuous with respect to $S_a(\cdot,\cdot,\omega)$, i.e.

$$w_0(x) - w_0(y) \leq S_a(y,x,\omega) \qquad \text{for every } x,y \in C.$$

We recall that the function given above is also the maximal subsolution taking the value w_0 on C and hence a solution in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus C$. Furthermore we have (see [17]):

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\omega \in \Omega_f$. Then*

(i) If $C \subset \mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$ then (13), with $a = c_f$ and w_0 1–Lipschitz continuous with respect to S_{c_f}, yields a solution on the whole $\mathbb{R}^N$.

(ii) If U is a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $a > c_f$ and w_0 a function defined on ∂U which is 1–Lipschitz continuous with respect to S_{c_f}, then (13) with C replaced by ∂U is the unique viscosity solution of the Dirichlet Problem:

$$\begin{cases} H(x, D\phi(x), \omega) = a & \text{in } U \\ \phi(x) = w_0(x) & \text{on } \partial U. \end{cases}$$

(iii) If U is as above, $a = c_f$ and w_0 a function defined on $\partial U \cup (U \cap \mathcal{A}_f)$ which is 1–Lipschitz continuous with respect to S_{c_f}, then (13) with C replaced by $\partial U \cup (U \cap \mathcal{A}_f)$ is the unique viscosity solution of the Dirichlet Problem:

$$\begin{cases} H(x, D\phi(x), \omega) = c_f & \text{in } U \setminus \mathcal{A}_f \\ \phi(x) = w_0(x) & \text{on } \partial U \cup (U \cap \mathcal{A}_f). \end{cases}$$

We define for every $\omega \in \Omega$ the set of *equilibria* as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}(\omega) := \{ y \in \mathbb{R} \, : \, \min_p H(y, p, \omega) = c_f \, \}.$$

The set $\mathcal{E}(\omega)$ is a (possibly empty) closed subset of $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$ (cf. [17, Lemma 5.2]). It is apparent that $c_f \geq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \min_{p \in \mathbb{R}^N} H(x, p, \omega)$ a.s. in ω; we point out that $\mathcal{E}(\omega)$ is nonempty if and only if the previous formula holds with an equality and the sup is a maximum. In this case, $\mathcal{E}(\omega)$ is made up by the points where such a maximum is attained. Note that $\omega \mapsto \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \min_{p \in \mathbb{R}^N} H(x, p, \omega)$ is a random variable and consequently, by ergodicity, almost surely constant.

Remark 4.7. The inclusion $\mathcal{E}(\omega) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$ depends on the fact that the c_f–sublevel $\{p \, : \, H(y, p, \omega) \leq c_f\}$ is non–void and has empty interior when $y \in \mathcal{E}(\omega)$. The latter is a consequence of (H4), and this is actually the unique point where such condition is used.

We proceed giving a stochastic version of Lax formula in order to recover the previous properties in our setting. Let $C(\omega)$ be an almost surely nonempty stationary closed random set in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Take a Lipschitz random function g and set, for $a \geq c_f$,

$$u(x, \omega) := \inf\{ g(y, \omega) + S_a(y, x, \omega) \, : \, y \in C(\omega) \} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{14}$$

where we agree that $u(\cdot, \omega) \equiv 0$ when either $C(\omega) = \emptyset$ or the infimum above is $-\infty$. The following holds:

Proposition 4.8. *Let g be a stationary Lipschitz random function and $C(\omega)$, u as above. Let us assume that, for some $a \geq c_f$, the infimum in (14) is finite a.s. in ω. Then u is a stationary random variable belonging to $\mathcal{S}_a$ and satisfies $u(\cdot, \omega) \leq g(\cdot, \omega)$ on $C(\omega)$ a.s. in ω. Moreover, u is a viscosity solution of (6) in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus C(\omega)$ a.s. in ω.*

When g is itself an admissible subsolution of (6), we can state a stronger version of the previous result.

Proposition 4.9. *Let g be a random function belonging to $\mathcal{S}_a$ and $C(\omega)$, u as above. Then u belongs to $\mathcal{S}_a$. In addition, it is a viscosity solution of* (6) *in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus C(\omega)$, and takes the value $g(\cdot,\omega)$ on $C(\omega)$ a.s. in ω.*

As already pointed in the Introduction, the property of being C a closed stationary set is of crucial importance to show that formula (14) defines an admissible Lipschitz random function. The proofs of the above results are analogous to those of Proposition 5.2. and 5.3 in [11], respectively, where the case $N = 1$ is considered.

Later on, we will make use of the Lax–type formula (14) when the random source set is either $\mathcal{A}_f$ or $\mathcal{E}$. In order to exploit the previous results, we will need the following

Proposition 4.10. *$\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{A}_f$ are closed random stationary sets.*

Proof. For every $(x,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$, let us set $h(x,\omega) = \min_p H(x,p,\omega)$ and

$$f(x,\omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 \sigma_{c_f}(\gamma,\dot\gamma,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s \;:\; \gamma \in \mathrm{Lip}_{x,x}([0,1],\mathbb{R}^N),\ \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma) \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{E}(\omega) = \{\, y \in \mathbb{R}^N \,:\, h(y,\omega) = c_f \,\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega) = \{\, y \in \mathbb{R}^N \,:\, f(y,\omega) = 0 \,\}$. In view of Proposition 3.1, it suffices to show that the stationary functions h and f are jointly measurable in (x,ω) and continuous in x for every fixed ω.

The continuity of h in x can be directly deduced from its very definition by making use of assumptions (H1) and (H3); for the measurability issue, simply notice that $h(x,\omega) = \inf_{p_k \in \mathbb{Q}} H(x,p_k,\omega)$.

Let us consider the random variable f. It is easy to derive from its definition that $f(x,\omega) - f(y,\omega) \leq 2\,\kappa_{c_f}|x-y|$ for every x, $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, thus proving the continuous character of $f(\cdot,\omega)$ for every fixed $\omega \in \Omega$. For the measurability issue, it suffices to show that the map $\omega \mapsto f(x,\omega)$ is measurable in Ω for every fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ by Proposition 2.1. To this purpose, let us fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and consider the countable family $(\gamma_n)_n$ of polygonal loops with vertexes in $x + \mathbb{Q}^N$, having x as base point, and of Euclidean length greater than 1. We claim that

$$f(x,\omega) = \inf_n \int_0^1 \sigma_{c_f}(\gamma_n,\dot\gamma_n,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s,$$

which clearly implies the asserted measurability of f. Indeed, for any loop γ having x as base point and Euclidean length greater than or equal to 1, an Euler–type approximation provides a subsequence $(\gamma_{n_k})_k$ of the family uniformly converging to γ and such that $\sup_k \|\dot\gamma_{n_k}\|_\infty < +\infty$. In particular, the curves γ_{n_k} weakly converge to γ in $W^{1,1}([0,1],\mathbb{R}^N)$. Being $\sigma_{c_f}(\cdot,\cdot,\omega)$ upper semicontinuous for every fixed ω, by classical results of the Calculus of Variations [4] we derive

$$\limsup_{k\to+\infty} \int_0^1 \sigma_{c_f}(\gamma_{n_k},\,\dot\gamma_{n_k},\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s \leq \int_0^1 \sigma_{c_f}(\gamma,\,\dot\gamma,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

That yields

$$f(x,\omega) \leq \inf_n \int_0^1 \sigma_{c_f}(\gamma_n,\dot\gamma_n,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s \leq \int_0^1 \sigma_{c_f}(\gamma,\,\dot\gamma,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s \qquad \text{for every } \omega,$$

and the claim follows by taking the infimum of the right–hand side term of the above inequality when γ varies in the family of loops with base point x and of Euclidean length greater than or equal to 1. □

5. Stable norms

In this section, we show the existence of asymptotic norm–type functions associated with S_a, whenever $a \geq c_f$, and explore their link with the effective Hamiltonian $\overline{H}$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we define

$$S_a^\varepsilon(x, y, \omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 \sigma_a(\gamma(t)/\varepsilon, \dot\gamma(t), \omega)\, \mathrm{d}t \;:\; \gamma \in \mathrm{Lip}_{x,y}([0,1], \mathbb{R}^N) \right\}$$

for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\omega \in \Omega_f$, where we agree that $S_a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, \omega) \equiv 0$ when $\omega \in \Omega \backslash \Omega_f$. Note that $S_a^\varepsilon(x, y, \omega) = \varepsilon\, S_a(x/\varepsilon, y/\varepsilon, \omega)$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $a \geq c_f$. There exists a convex and positively 1–homogeneous function $\phi_a : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$S_a^\varepsilon(x, y, \omega) \quad \underset{\varepsilon \to 0}{\rightrightarrows} \quad \phi_a(y - x), \qquad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{15}$$

for any ω in a set Ω_a of probability 1. In addition, ϕ_a is nonnegative for $a = c$, and nondegenerate, i.e. satisfying $\phi_a(\cdot) \geq \delta_a |\cdot|$ for some $\delta_a > 0$, when $a > c$.

With some abuse of terminology, we will refer to the function ϕ_a appearing in the statement above as the *stable norm* associated with S_a, in analogy with the case of periodic Riemannian metrics. The above theorem states that ϕ_a is a *Minkowski norm* (i.e. a norm which fails to be symmetric) when $a > c$; it can possibly degenerate when $a = c$, in the sense that ϕ_c may be identically 0 along some directions.

Proof. The proof is basically divided in two parts. In the first half, we essentially follow the arguments of [22], to which we refer for the details (cf. also [23]). The second half, based on a combined use of Egoroff's and Birkhoff Ergodic Theorems, follows an argument provided in [24], which is also needed in [23] to complete the proof of Theorem 1.

Since for every ω the functions $\{S_a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, \omega)\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ are equiLipschitz–continuous, the local uniformity of the asserted convergence is a consequence of Ascoli–Arzelá Theorem, once we show that there is pointwise convergence.

The first step is to consider the sequence of random variables $S_a(0, n\,q, \omega)$, where q is any vector of $\mathbb{R}^N$. The subadditive decomposition through the double indexed random variables $S_a(m\,q, n\,q, \omega)$, $0 \leq m \leq n$, allows to apply the Subadditive Ergodic Theorem and deduce the existence of

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n}\, S_a(0, n\,q, \omega) = \lim_{n \to \infty} S_a^{1/n}(0, q, \omega)$$

for ω belonging to some set Ω_q of probability 1. The estimate $|S_a(0, nq, \omega)| \leq \kappa_a\, n |q|$, which holds for every ω, implies that such limit is almost surely finite. Since for every fixed ω the functions $\{S_a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, \omega)\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ are equiLipschitz–continuous, we derive that the same limit is attained by $S_a^\varepsilon(0, q, \omega)$, as ε goes to 0, for $\omega \in \Omega_q$, and stays unaffected passing from ω to $\tau_z \omega$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, which in turn implies that it is almost surely constant by ergodicity. By possibly redefining Ω_q if necessary, we set

$$\phi_a(q) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} S_a^\varepsilon(0, q, \omega), \qquad \omega \in \Omega_q. \tag{16}$$

Then ϕ_a is Lipschitz–continuous with Lipschitz constant κ_a. By taking a sequence $(q_n)_n$ dense in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and exploiting the equiLipschitz–continuity of $\{S_a^\varepsilon(0, \cdot, \omega)\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$

and $\phi_a(\cdot)$, we see that the convergence in (16) takes place for any $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$ whenever $\omega \in \widehat{\Omega}_a := \cap_n \Omega_{q_n}$. In addition, by the Subadditive ergodic Theorem

$$S_a^\varepsilon(0, q, \omega) \to \phi_a(q) \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega) \qquad \text{for any } q \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Let us now fix x, y in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Since $S_a^\varepsilon(x, y, \omega) = S_a^\varepsilon(0, y - x, \tau_{x/\varepsilon}\omega)$ a.s. in ω, and $\tau_{x/\varepsilon}$ is measure preserving, we deduce

$$\mathbb{E}(|S_a^\varepsilon(0, y - x, \cdot) - \phi_a(y - x)|) = \mathbb{E}(|S_a^\varepsilon(x, y, \cdot) - \phi_a(y - x)|),$$

and so

$$S_a^\varepsilon(x, y, \omega) \to \phi_a(y - x) \qquad \text{in } L^1(\Omega).$$

We now proceed to show that there exists a fixed set of probability 1 on which this convergence also holds pointwise, for any pair x, y in $\mathbb{R}^N$. For this, we make a combined use of Egoroff's and Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem.

Since the functions $q \mapsto S_a^\varepsilon(0, q, \omega)$ are equiLipschitz–continuous and locally equibounded for every ω we deduce that, for every $r > 0$,

$$\sup_{|q| \le 2r} |S_a^\varepsilon(0, q, \omega) - \phi_a(q)| \underset{\varepsilon \to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0 \qquad \omega \in \widehat{\Omega}_a.$$

We use Egoroff's Theorem to make this convergence uniform in ω on large sets, when $r \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ (the set of positive rational numbers): for every $\delta > 0$, we find a set A_δ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega \setminus A_\delta) \le \delta$ such that

$$\sup_{\omega \in A_\delta} \left(\sup_{|q| \le 2r} |S_a^\varepsilon(0, q, \omega) - \phi_a(q)| \right) \underset{\varepsilon \to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0,$$

for every $r \in \mathbb{Q}^+$. The Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem applied to the function χ_{A_δ} yields the existence of a set Ω^δ of probability 1 with

$$\lim_{R \to +\infty} \fint_{B_R} \chi_{A_\delta}(\tau_x \omega)\, \mathrm{d}x = \mathbb{P}(A_\delta) \qquad \text{for every } \omega \in \Omega^\delta,$$

in other terms for every $\omega \in \Omega^\delta$

$$\frac{\big|\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \,:\, \tau_x \omega \in A_\delta\,\} \cap B_R\big|}{|B_R|} \ge \mathbb{P}(A_\delta) - \delta \ge 1 - 2\delta, \tag{17}$$

whenever R is large enough. We set $\Omega_a := \cap_{\delta \in \mathbb{Q}^+} \Omega^\delta$. Given $\omega_0 \in \Omega_a$, for any $\alpha > 0$ we can therefore find, according to (17), a pair of positive numbers $\delta(\alpha)$ and $R(\alpha)$ such that, if $|z_0| \ge R(\alpha)$, any ball centered at z_0 with radius exceeding $\alpha|z_0|$ must intersect $\{x \,:\, \tau_x \omega_0 \in A_{\delta(\alpha)}\,\}$, or equivalently

$$|z_0 - z| \le \alpha |z_0| \quad \text{for some } z \text{ with } \tau_z \omega_0 \in A_{\delta(\alpha)}. \tag{18}$$

Now fix $\alpha > 0$, and pick a pair of points x, y in $\mathbb{R}^N$. We assume that they both belong to B_r for some $r \in \mathbb{Q}^+$. Let ε_0 be such that

$$\sup_{\omega \in A_{\delta(\alpha)}} \left(\sup_{|q| \le 2r} |S_a^\varepsilon(0, q, \omega) - \phi_a(q)| \right) \le \alpha \quad \text{for } \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0$$

and

$$\frac{|x|}{\varepsilon_0} > R(\alpha).$$

We denote, for $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, by z_ε a point such that (18) holds true with z_ε, $\frac{x}{\varepsilon}$ in place of z, z_0, respectively. Accordingly $|x - \varepsilon z_\varepsilon| \leq \alpha\, r$, and for $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |S^\varepsilon_a(x,y,\omega_0) \; - \; \phi_a(y-x)| &\leq |S^\varepsilon_a(x,y,\omega_0) - S^\varepsilon_a(\varepsilon z_\varepsilon, y, \omega_0)| \\ &+ \; |S^\varepsilon_a(\varepsilon z_\varepsilon, y,\omega_0) - \phi_a(y - \varepsilon z_\varepsilon)| + |\phi_a(y-\varepsilon z_\varepsilon) - \phi_a(y-x)| \\ &\leq \; 2\,\kappa_a\,\alpha\, r + |S^\varepsilon_a(0, y - \varepsilon z_\varepsilon, \tau_{z_\varepsilon}\omega_0) - \phi_a(y-\varepsilon z_\varepsilon)| \leq \alpha\,(2\kappa_a\, r + 1). \end{aligned}$$

As α was arbitrarily chosen, we conclude that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} S^\varepsilon_a(x,y,\omega_0) = \phi_a(y-x),$$

as desired.

It comes from its very definition that ϕ_a is positively homogeneous. To prove that it is convex, we pick $\omega \in \Omega_a$, $\lambda \in (0,1)$, x, y in $\mathbb{R}^N$, and we pass to the limit, as ε goes to 0, in the inequality

$$S^\varepsilon_a(0, \lambda\, x + (1-\lambda)\, y, \omega) \leq S^\varepsilon_a(0, \lambda\, x, \omega) + S^\varepsilon_a(\lambda\, x, \lambda\, x + (1-\lambda)\, y, \omega).$$

For the sign of ϕ_a, we take $v \in \mathcal{S}_c$. From (11) we know that, for every $a \geq c$, there exists $\delta_a \geq 0$ with

$$S^\varepsilon_a(0,q,\omega) = \varepsilon\, S_a(0, q/\varepsilon, \omega) \geq \delta_a |q| + \frac{v(q/\varepsilon,\omega) - v(0,\omega)}{1/\varepsilon},$$

for any $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$. In addition, $\delta_a > 0$ when $a > c$. By the sublinear character of $v(\cdot,\omega)$ a.s. in ω, we obtain in the limit $\phi_a(q) \geq \delta_a |q|$. □

We proceed recalling a result proved in [22, 23]. In what follows, we will denote by L the Lagrangian associated with H via the Fenchel transform, i.e.

$$L(x,q,\omega) := \max_{p \in \mathbb{R}^N} \big(\langle q, p\rangle - H(x,p,\omega)\big), \qquad (x,q,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega.$$

Proposition 5.2. *For every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t > 0$ let*

$$h_t(x,y,\omega) := \inf \left\{ \int_0^t L(\gamma, \dot\gamma, \omega)\, \mathrm{d}s \,:\, W^{1,1}([0,t], \mathbb{R}^N),\ \gamma(0) = x,\ \gamma(t) = y \right\}.$$

Then there exists a convex and superlinear function $\overline{L} : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for any ω in a set Ω_0 of probability 1 the following convergence holds

$$\frac{h_t(0,tq,\omega)}{t} \underset{t \to +\infty}{\rightrightarrows} \overline{L}(q), \qquad q \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{19}$$

The function $\overline{L}$ is called the *effective Lagrangian*, and the *effective Hamiltonian* is accordingly defined through the Fenchel transform as follows:

$$\overline{H}(p) = \max_{q \in \mathbb{R}^N} \big(\langle p, q\rangle - \overline{L}(q)\big) \qquad \text{for every } p \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Theorem 5.3. *For every $a \geq c_f$, the stable norm ϕ_a is the support function of the a–sublevel of the effective Hamiltonian $\overline{H}$.*

Proof. We denote by $\overline{\sigma}_a(\cdot)$ the support function of the a–sublevel of $\overline{H}$. From the inequality $L(x,q,\omega) + a \geq \sigma_a(x,q,\omega)$, holding for any $a \geq c_f$ and $(x,q,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega_f$, we infer

$$\frac{h_t(0,\lambda\, t\, q,\omega) + a\, t}{\lambda\, t} \geq \frac{1}{\lambda\, t} S_a(0, \lambda\, t\, q, \omega)$$

for every $\lambda > 0$ and $t > 0$. Passing to the limit for t going to $+\infty$ we find

$$\lambda^{-1}\,\left(\overline{L}(\lambda\, q) + a\right) \geq \phi_a(q)$$

and, taking into account the identity

$$\overline{\sigma}_a(q) = \inf_{\lambda > 0}\left\{\lambda^{-1}\,\left(\overline{L}(\lambda\, q) + a\right)\right\},$$

we conclude that $\overline{\sigma}_a(\cdot) \geq \phi_a(\cdot)$. We divide the proof of the converse inequality in two steps.

Case 1: $a > c_f$. Clearly, it is enough to show that $\overline{\sigma}_a(q) \leq \phi_a(q)$ for every $q \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$. Let us fix such a q and pick an ω_0 such that both (19) and (15) hold. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\gamma_n : [0, \ell_n] \to \mathbb{R}^N$ be a curve parameterized by the arc–length with $\gamma_n(0) = 0$, $\gamma_n(\ell_n) = nq$ and such that

$$1 + S_a(0, nq, \omega_0) > \int_0^{\ell_n} \sigma_a(\gamma_n, \dot\gamma_n, \omega_0)\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

We first claim that there exists a constant C such that $n \leq \ell_n \leq C\,n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, let $v \in \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $H(x, Dv(x), \omega_0) \leq c_f$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^N$. As $a > c_f$, there exists by (11) a constant $\delta_a > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^{\ell_n} \sigma_a(\gamma_n, \dot\gamma_n, \omega_0)\,\mathrm{d}t \geq v(nq) - v(0) + \delta_a\,\ell_n,$$

so the claim follows with $C = (1 + 2\,\kappa_a)/\delta_a$. According to the results proved in [9] (cf. Lemma 3.4, Proposition 3.7 and Lemma 3.14) there exists a Borel–measurable function $\underline{\lambda}_a : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \to [0, +\infty)$ such that

$$L(x, \underline{\lambda}_a(x, v)\, v, \omega_0) = \sigma_a(x, \underline{\lambda}_a(x, v)\, v, \omega_0) - a \qquad \text{for every } (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{S}^{N-1}.$$

Furthermore $\underline{\lambda}_a$ enjoys the following inequality

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_a} \leq \underline{\lambda}_a(x, v) \leq \lambda_a \qquad \text{for every } (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{S}^{N-1},$$

where λ_a is a positive real constant depending on H and a only. Set

$$f_n(s) := \int_0^s \frac{1}{\underline{\lambda}_a(\gamma_n(\varsigma), \dot\gamma_n(\varsigma))}\,\mathrm{d}\varsigma \qquad \text{for any } s \in [0, \ell_n],$$

and $\varphi_n = f_n^{-1}$ on $[0, f_n(\ell_n)]$. It is easily seen that φ_n is a strictly increasing bi–Lipschitz homeomorphism from $[0, f_n(\ell_n)]$ to $[0, \ell_n]$, and that $n/\lambda_a \leq f_n(\ell_n) \leq C\lambda_a\, n$. Arguing as in [9], we get that the curve

$$\xi_n(s) := (\gamma_n \circ \varphi_n)(s), \qquad s \in [0, f_n(\ell_n)]$$

is a reparameterization of γ_n such that

$$\int_0^{\ell_n} \sigma_a(\gamma_n, \dot\gamma_n, \omega_0)\,\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^{f_n(\ell_n)} \Big(L(\xi_n, \dot\xi_n, \omega_0) + a\Big)\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_n(\ell_n) = \lambda_n\, n$ with $\lambda_n \in [1/\lambda_a, C\lambda_a]$. Up to subsequence, we can assume that $\lambda_n \to \lambda$ as $n \to +\infty$. Then we get

$$\frac{1 + S_a(0, nq, \omega_0)}{n} \geq \frac{h_{\lambda_n n}(0, nq, \omega_0)}{n} + \lambda_n\, a = \lambda_n\, \frac{h_{\lambda_n n}(0, \lambda_n n\, q/\lambda_n, \omega_0)}{\lambda_n n} + \lambda_n\, a$$

and sending $n \to +\infty$ we finally obtain

$$\phi_a(q) \geq \lambda\left(\overline{L}(q/\lambda) + a\right) \geq \overline{\sigma}_a(q).$$

Step 2: $a = c_f$. We want to show that $\phi_{c_f}(\cdot) \equiv \overline{\sigma}_{c_f}(\cdot)$. By the previous step and by definition of $\overline{\sigma}_a$ we have

$$\overline{\sigma}_{c_f}(q) = \inf_{a>c_f} \overline{\sigma}_a(q) = \inf_{a>c_f} \phi_a(q) \qquad \text{for every } q \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

We therefore get the assertion showing

$$\phi_{c_f}(q) = \inf_{a>c_f} \phi_a(q) \quad \text{for every } q \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

The inequality $\phi_{c_f}(q) \le \inf_{a>c_f} \phi_a(q)$ comes directly from the monotonicity of $a \mapsto S_a(0, nq, \omega)$. For the converse, we fix q and invoke Kingman's Subadditive Ergodic Theorem to get

$$\phi_a(q) = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}\big(S_a(0, nq, \cdot)\big) \qquad \text{for every } a > c_f.$$

Since $S_{c_f}(0, nq, \omega) = \inf_{a>c_f} S_a(0, nq, \omega)$ for every ω, the Monotone Convergence Theorem then implies

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}(S_{c_f}(0, nq, \cdot) = \frac{1}{n} \inf_{a>c_f} \mathbb{E}(S_a(0, nq, \cdot)) \ge \inf_{a>c_f} \phi_a(q),$$

and sending $n \to +\infty$ we obtain $\phi_{c_f}(q) \ge \inf_{a>c_f} \phi_a(q)$, as claimed. □

6. Final results

In this section we exploit the previous analysis on stable norms and the Lax formula given in Section 4 to establish relevant properties of the effective Hamiltonian as well as some existence/nonexistence result for exavt and approximate correctors.

Theorem 6.1. $\min_{\mathbb{R}^N} \overline{H} = c_f$.

Proof. The inequality $\min_{\mathbb{R}^N} \overline{H} \le c_f$ is immediate since the c_f–sublevel of $\overline{H}$ is nonempty, being $\overline{\sigma}_{c_f} = \phi_{c_f}$ finite by Theorems 5.1 and 5.3.

Let us prove $\min_{\mathbb{R}^N} \overline{H} \ge c_f$. Pick an ω in Ω_f. By Proposition 2-1.1 in [8] we know that, for every $a < c_f$,

$$\inf_{t>0} \left(h_t(0, 0, \omega) + at\right) = -\infty,$$

in particular there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $h_{t_0}(0, 0, \omega) + at_0 < 0$. Since $h_{t+s}(0, 0, \omega) \le h_t(0, 0, \omega) + h_s(0, 0, \omega)$ for every $s, t > 0$ by the definition of h_t, we infer

$$\liminf_{t\to+\infty} \frac{h_t(0, 0, \omega) + at}{t} \le \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{n\left(h_{t_0}(0, 0, \omega) + at_0\right)}{nt_0} < 0.$$

In view of Proposition 5.2, we get $\overline{L}(0) + a < 0$ for every $a < c_f$, that is $-\overline{L}(0) \ge c_f$. The assertion follows since $-\overline{L}(0) = \min_{\mathbb{R}^N} \overline{H}$. □

We exploit Proposition 4.8 to get

Proposition 6.2. *Let $a \ge c_f$ such that the corresponding stable norm is nondegenerate. Then equation* (6) *admits admissible stationary subsolutions.*

Proof. By hypothesis there exists $\delta_a > 0$ such that $\phi_a(q) \geq \delta_a |q|$ for every $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$. By Theorems 5.1 and 5.3 we derive

$$\liminf_{|y| \to +\infty} \frac{S(y,x,\omega)}{|y-x|} \geq \delta_a \qquad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^N$$

a.s. in ω. In particular $\inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N} S_a(y,x,\omega) > -\infty$ a.s. in ω for every fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. According to Proposition 4.8, an admissible stationary subsolution of (6) is obtained via (14) with $g(\cdot,\omega) \equiv 0$ and $C(\omega) = \mathbb{R}^N$ for every ω. □

We make use of the previous results to give a characterization of the stationary critical value.

Theorem 6.3. *$c = \inf\{a \geq c_f \,:\, \phi_a$ is nondegenerate$\}$. If $c > c_f$ then ϕ_c is degenerate but nonnegative.*

Proof. Let us call μ the infimum appearing in the statement. According to Theorem 5.1, $c \geq \mu$. The converse inequality is apparent by Proposition 6.2 since equation (6) admits admissible subsolutions for every $a > \mu$.

Assume by contradiction that $c > c_f$ and ϕ_c is nondegenerate. Then, since ϕ_a coincide with a–sublevel of $\overline{H}$, by continuity the same property holds for ϕ_a with $a < c$ and suitably close to c. That is in contradiction with Proposition 6.2. □

Remark 6.4. In view of Theorem 5.3, the property of being ϕ_a non–degenerate is equivalent to the condition $0 \in \mathrm{Int}(\overline{Z}_a)$. So Theorem 6.3 can be equivalently restated by saying that $c = \inf\{a \geq c_f \,:\, 0 \in \mathrm{Int}(\overline{Z}_a)\}$, with $0 \in \partial \overline{Z}_c$ whenever $c > c_f$. See [11] for the analogy with the 1–dimensional case.

We derive from Proposition 6.2 and Theorem 6.3

$$c := \inf\{a \in \mathbb{R} \,:\, (6) \text{ admits stationary subsolutions}\}.$$

The infimum appearing in the formula is not necessarily a minimum, namely we cannot expect, in general, to find stationary critical subsolutions.

The next theorem relates the effective Hamiltonian to the stationary critical value. The result has been already established by Lions and Souganidis in [20] through PDE techniques. We propose a new, simpler proof based on the properties of the intrinsic metrics and on Theorems 5.1, 5.3.

Theorem 6.5. *$\overline{H}$ coincides with the function associating to any $P \in \mathbb{R}^N$ the stationary critical value of the Hamiltonian $H(x, P+p, \omega)$.*

Proof. We first prove the assertion for $P = 0$, i.e., with the notation used so far, that $\overline{H}(0) = c$. We know by Theorem 5.1 that $\phi_c(q) \geq 0$ for every $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$. This means, in view of Theorem 5.3, that $0 \in \overline{Z}_c$, i.e. $c \geq \overline{H}(0)$. On the other hand the inequality $c > \overline{H}(0)$, i.e. $0 \in \mathrm{Int}(\overline{Z}_c)$, may occur only when $c = c_f$ by Remark 6.4, but this is not possible since $\overline{H}(0) \geq c_f$ by Theorem 6.1.

To prove the assertion for any $P \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we apply the previous argument to the Hamiltonian $H_P(x,p,\omega) := H(x, P+p, \omega)$ and derive that $\overline{H}_P(0) = c_P$, where $\overline{H}_P$ and c_P are the associated effective Hamiltonian and stationary critical value. To get the assertion, it is left to show that $\overline{H}_P(0) = \overline{H}(P)$. To this purpose, denote by L_P the Lagrangian associated with H_P. It is easily seen that $L_P(x,q,\omega)$ coincides with $L(x,q,\omega) - \langle P, q \rangle$, so the claimed equality follows from the definition of effective Hamiltonian by exploiting Proposition 5.2 with L_P in place of L. □

We now address our attention to the issue of the existence/nonexistence of exact or approximate correctors.

Theorem 6.6.

(i) *If* $c = c_f$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega) \neq \emptyset$ *a.s. in* ω*, then there exists a corrector for* (10)*.*

(ii) *If* ϕ_c *is nondegenerate, then* $c = c_f$ *and a corrector for* (10) *exists if and only if* $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega) \neq \emptyset$ *a.s. in* ω*.*

(iii) *If* ϕ_c *is nondegenerate and* $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega) \neq \emptyset$ *a.s. in* ω*, then the classical Aubry set is an uniqueness set for the critical equation, in the sense that two correctors agreeing on* $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$ *a.s. in* ω*, coincide on the whole* $\mathbb{R}^N$ *a.s. in* ω*. More precisely, any corrector* u *can be written as*

$$u(x,\omega) = \inf\{u(y,\omega) + S_c(y,x,\omega) \,:\, y \in \mathcal{A}_f(\omega)\} \quad \text{a.s. in } \omega. \tag{20}$$

Proof. *(i)* By Proposition 4.10 $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$ is a stationary closed random set. Hence, for any $g \in \mathcal{S}_c$, the function u given by the Lax formula with $a = c$, $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$ as source set and trace g on it, is a corrector by Theorem 4.6 (i).

(ii) The equality $c = c_f$ follows from Theorem 6.3. If $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega) \neq \emptyset$ a.s. in ω, a corrector for (10) exists by assertion (i). To prove the converse implication, let us assume by contradiction that a corrector u does exist and that $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega) = \emptyset$ a.s. in ω. Pick ω such that $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega) = \emptyset$ and $u(\cdot,\omega)$ is a viscosity solution of (10). Take $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the classical Aubry set is empty, we derive by Theorem 4.6 that $u(\cdot,\omega)$ is the unique viscosity solution of the Dirichlet Problem

$$\begin{cases} H(x, D\phi(x), \omega) = c_f & \text{in } B_n \\ \phi(x) = u(x,\omega) & \text{on } \partial B_n, \end{cases}$$

and

$$u(x,\omega) = \min_{y \in \partial B_n} \{u(y,\omega) + S_{c_f}(y,x,\omega)\} \qquad x \in B_n.$$

We deduce that there exists a diverging sequence $(y_n)_n$ such that

$$S_{c_f}(y_n, 0, \omega) = u(0,\omega) - u(y_n,\omega) \qquad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By exploiting the fact that $u(\cdot,\omega)$ is sublinear a.s. in ω, we derive

$$\min_{q \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}} \phi_{c_f}(q) = \liminf_{|y| \to +\infty} \frac{S_{c_f}(y,0,\omega)}{|y|} \le \liminf_{n \to +\infty} \frac{u(0,\omega) - u(y_n,\omega)}{|y_n|} = 0 \qquad \text{a.s. in } \omega,$$

in contrast with the hypothesis that ϕ_{c_f} is nondegenerate.

(iii) We take a corrector u and fix an $\omega \in \Omega_f$ such that $u(\cdot,\omega)$ is a solution to (10) sublinear at infinity and $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega) \neq \emptyset$. Arguing as for item (ii), we see that for any given $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ there is $n = n(\omega)$ such that

$$u(x_0,\omega) < \inf\{u(z,\omega) + S_c(z,x_0,\omega) \,:\, z - x_0 \in \partial B_n\}.$$

According to Theorem 4.6 (iii), we deduce the existence of $y_0 \in \mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$ with

$$u(x_0,\omega) = u(y_0,\omega) + S_c(y_0,x_0,\omega),$$

and consequently

$$u(x_0,\omega) \ge \inf\{u(y,\omega) + S_c(y,x_0,\omega) \,:\, y \in \mathcal{A}_f(\omega)\}.$$

On the other side by Theorem 4.6 (i) the right hand–side of the previous formula is the maximal subsolution to (10) taking the value $u(\cdot,\omega)$ on $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega)$, which implies (20). $\square$

In the case where $c = c_f = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} \min_{p\in\mathbb{R}^N} H(x,p,\omega)$ a.s. in ω, item (i) of the previous theorem can be complemented as follows:

Proposition 6.7. *Assume $c = c_f = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} \min_{p\in\mathbb{R}^N} H(x,p,\omega)$ and $\mathcal{A}_f(\omega) = \emptyset$ a.s. in ω, then equation* (10) *admits approximate correctors.*

Proof. We fix $g \in \mathcal{S}_c$ and define, for any $\delta > 0$

$$\mathcal{E}_\delta(\omega) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \,:\, \min_{p\in\mathbb{R}^N} H(x,p,\omega) \geq c - \delta\}.$$

Arguing as we did for $\mathcal{E}$ in Proposition 4.10, we see that $\mathcal{E}_\delta(\omega)$ is a closed random stationary set and is, in addition, a.s. nonempty. We claim that Lax formula with $\mathcal{E}_\delta(\omega)$ as source set and g as trace on it, provides a δ–approximate corrector.

We denote by v_δ the random function constructed as above indicated. By Proposition 4.8 we already know that v_δ is an admissible subsolution to (10), and a solution as well on $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \mathcal{E}_\delta(\omega)$ a.s. in ω. Further, if ϕ is a C^1 test function touching $v_\delta(\cdot,\omega)$ at $y \in \mathcal{E}_\delta(\omega)$ from below, then $H(y, D\phi(y,\omega),\omega) \geq c - \delta$ by the very definition of $\mathcal{E}_\delta(\omega)$, as it was to be shown. $\square$

A class of critical stochastic equations satisfying the assumptions of the previous theorem are those of Eikonal type

$$|Du(x,\omega)|^2 = V(x,\omega)^2 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{21}$$

where $V : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a jointly measurable function satisfying:

(1) $\quad V(x+z,\omega) = V(x,\tau_z\omega)$ for every $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\omega \in \Omega$;

(2) $\quad V(\cdot,\omega)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^N$ for every ω;

(3) $\quad 0 = \inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\cdot,\omega) < \sup_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\cdot,\omega) < +\infty$ a.s. in ω;

(4) $\quad V(x,\omega) > 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ a.s. in ω.

We can show, by exploiting an example in [20], that a random function of this type does always exist in any space dimension, cf. Example 6.8 below.

If we add to the assumptions of Proposition 6.7 the nondegeneracy of the critical stable norm, then we can also assert, according to Theorems 6.6 (ii), the nonexistence of exact correctors. In dimension 1 a sufficient conditions for such a nondegeneracy is that there is a strict critical admissible subsolution; this role is for instance played by the null function for the above described Eikonal class. The point is that in the 1–dimensional case the a–sublevel of the effective Hamiltonian, for any $a \geq c_f$, coincides with the averaged a–sublevel $\mathbb{E}[Z_a]$ of H, given by

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_a] = \{\mathbb{E}(\Phi) \,:\, \Phi \text{ measurable selection of } \omega \mapsto Z(0,\omega)\}.$$

Due to the stationarity properties of the Hamiltonian, the previous definition does not change if we replace 0 by any other $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. For every x, the map $\omega \mapsto Z(x,\omega)$ is a random closed set taking compact convex values and (see [21])

$$\sigma_{\mathbb{E}[Z_a]}(q) = \mathbb{E}\big(\sigma_a(x,q,\omega)\big), \qquad q \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where σ indicates the support function. In dimension 1 any such selection with vanishing mean gives rise, by integration, to an admissible subsolution, see [11], which actually explains why the existence of a strict admissible critical subsolution implies the nondegeneracy of the critical stable distance.

The situation is quite different in the multidimensional setting, where we can just assert that the sublevels of $\overline{H}$ are contained in the corresponding averaged sublevels of H. The next example shows that this inclusion can be strict and that the critical stable norm can be (even completely) degenerate in presence of a strict admissible critical subsolution.

Example 6.8. We provide below an example in dimension $N = 2$ of a function V satisfying assumptions (1)–(4) such that, for every ω in a set of probability 1,

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{S_0(0, tq, \omega)}{t} = 0 \qquad \text{for every } q \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1},$$

where S_0 is the distance associated with $H(x, p, \omega) := |p|^2 - V(x, \omega)^2$ via (12) with $a = 0$. According to the results obtained in the previous section, we derive that the corresponding stable norm is null, i.e. completely degenerate. Note that the null function is a strict admissible critical subsolution.

To this purpose, we start by defining a function $V_0 : \mathbb{T}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$V_0(z_1, z_2) = 2 - \cos(2\pi z_1) - \cos(2\pi z_2) \qquad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{T}^2.$$

Let us choose a $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and set $v_1 = (1, 0),\ v_2 = (\lambda, 0),\ v_3 = (0, 1),\ v_4 = (0, \lambda)$. Next we choose as Ω the torus $\mathbb{T}^4$, as $\mathbb{P}$ the Lebesgue measure restricted to $\mathbb{T}^4$, and as $\mathcal{F}$ the σ–algebra of Borel subsets of Ω. We define a group $(\tau_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2}$ of translations on Ω as follows:

$$\big(\tau_x(\omega)\big)_i \equiv \omega_i + \langle v_i, x\rangle \pmod 1 \qquad \text{for every } \omega \in \Omega \text{ and } i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}.$$

The group of translations $(\tau_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2}$ is ergodic, see for instance Appendix A in [12]. We define a function V on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Omega$ as

$$V(x, \omega) = V_0(\omega_1 + x_1, \omega_2 + \lambda x_1)\, V_0(\omega_3 + x_2, \omega_4 + \lambda x_2),$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4) \in \Omega$. Clearly, V is a jointly measurable function satisfying the above assumptions (1)–(3). Furthermore, V verifies assumption (4). Indeed, the function $V(\cdot, \omega)$ attains its infimum on $\mathbb{R}^2$ (that is, the value 0) if and only if $\omega \in \big(\Sigma \times \mathbb{T}^2\big) \cup \big(\mathbb{T}^2 \times \Sigma\big)$, where

$$\Sigma := \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \,:\, V_0(z_1 + t, z_2 + \lambda t) = 0 \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}\ \}.$$

We claim that $|\Sigma| = 0$. More precisely,

$$\Sigma = \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \,:\, \lambda z_1 - z_2 = \lambda n - m \text{ for some } n, m \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

To see this, note that $(z_1, z_2) \in \Sigma$ if and only if there exists $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$z_1 + t = n,\ z_2 + \lambda t = m \quad \text{for some } n, m \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and this occurs if and only if $\lambda z_1 - z_2 = \lambda n - m$ for some $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, as it was claimed.

According to the results of Section 5, we know that, for every ω in a set Ω_0 of probability 1, we have

$$\overline{\sigma}_0(q) = \lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{S_0(x, x + tq, \omega)}{t} \qquad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and } q \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}. \tag{22}$$

To prove that $\overline{\sigma}_0(\cdot) \equiv 0$, it is enough, by the properties enjoyed by $\overline{\sigma}_0$, to show that $\overline{\sigma}_0(\mathbf{e_1}) \le 0$ and $\overline{\sigma}_0(\mathbf{e_2}) \le 0$, where $\{\mathbf{e_1}, \mathbf{e_2}\}$ is the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^2$.

We only prove the assertion for $\mathbf{e_1}$, being the other case analogous. Pick an $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4) \in \Omega_0$, and fix an $\varepsilon > 0$. The orbit $\{(\omega_3 + x_2, \omega_4 + \lambda x_2) \,:\, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is dense in $\mathbb{T}^2$ for λ is irrational, so there exists a point $x_\varepsilon = (0, y_\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $V_0((\omega_3, \omega_4), (0, y_\varepsilon)) < \varepsilon$. By moving along the segment joining x_ε to $x_\varepsilon + t\mathbf{e_1}$, we obtain

$$S_0(x_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon + t\mathbf{e_1}, \omega) \leq \int_0^1 V(x_\varepsilon + s\, t\mathbf{e_1}, \omega) |t\, \mathbf{e_1}|\, \mathrm{d}s \leq 4\varepsilon\, t,$$

from which we derive $\overline{\sigma}_0(\mathbf{e_1}) \leq 4\varepsilon$ by (22). This concludes the proof as ε is an arbitrarily chosen positive number.

Appendix A.

The aim of this section is to provide complete proofs of Theorems 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9. For this, we need to develop some preliminary material.

We define an N–parameter group $(U_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N}$ of isometries on $\big(L^2(\Omega)\big)^N$ via

$$\begin{array}{rcl} U_x : \big(L^2(\Omega)\big)^N & \to & \big(L^2(\Omega)\big)^N \\ \Phi(\omega) & \mapsto & \Phi(\tau_x \omega) \end{array}$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. The group $(U_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N}$ is strongly continuous, in the sense that

$$\lim_{x \to 0} \|U_x \Phi - \Phi\|_{(L^2(\Omega))^N} = 0, \qquad \Phi \in \big(L^2(\Omega)\big)^N,$$

see [18]. Using this property, it is easy to prove:

Lemma A.1. *Let $\gamma : [0, T] \to \mathbb{R}^N$ be of class C^1. Then for every $\Phi \in \big(L^2(\Omega)\big)^N$ the map $t \mapsto \langle U_{\gamma(t)} \Phi, \dot{\gamma}(t) \rangle$, from $[0, T]$ to $L^2(\Omega)$, is continuous.*

Hence, for every curve $\gamma : [0, T] \to \mathbb{R}^N$ of class C^1 we can give a meaning, in the Cauchy sense, to the integral

$$\int_0^T \langle U_{\gamma(t)} \Phi, \dot{\gamma}(t) \rangle\, \mathrm{d}t = \int_0^T \langle \Phi(\tau_{\gamma(t)} \omega), \dot{\gamma}(t) \rangle\, \mathrm{d}t \tag{23}$$

as an element of $L^2(\Omega)$. We note that (23) is invariant under changes of parameterization; moreover, it makes sense even when γ is piecewise C^1, i.e. it is continuous and of class C^1 on $[0, T]$ up to a finite set of points. For any such γ we write

$$\int_\gamma \Phi(\omega) := \int_0^T \langle U_{\gamma(t)} \Phi(\omega), \dot{\gamma}(t) \rangle\, \mathrm{d}t \qquad \text{a.s. in } \omega.$$

The following result holds:

Lemma A.2. *Let $\gamma : [0, T] \to \mathbb{R}^N$ be a piecewise C^1 curve. Then the map*

$$\Phi \mapsto \int_\gamma \Phi$$

is linear and continuous from $\big(L^2(\Omega)\big)^N$ to $L^2(\Omega)$.

It is a direct consequence of the previous lemma that, if $\Phi_n \to \Phi$ in $(L^2(\Omega))^N$, then, for any given piecewise C^1 curve γ, one can extract a subsequence Φ_{n_k} with

$$\int_\gamma \Phi_{n_k}(\omega) \to \int_\gamma \Phi(\omega) \quad \text{a.s. in } \omega.$$

Note that here the subsequence depends on the curve γ. The step forward in the next result is to show that, under suitable additional assumptions, the sequence $(n_k)_k$ can be chosen in such a way that the above convergence takes place for any curve.

Lemma A.3. *Let $(\Phi_n)_n$ be a sequence in $(L^\infty(\Omega))^N$ with $\sup_n \|\Phi_n\|_\infty \le \kappa$ for some $\kappa > 0$. If Φ_n converges in $(L^2(\Omega))^N$ to some function Φ, then, up to extraction of a subsequence,*

$$\int_\gamma \Phi_n(\omega) \to \int_\gamma \Phi(\omega) \quad \textit{a.s. in } \omega$$

for all piecewise C^1 curve γ.

Proof. Up to extraction of a subsequence, Φ_n a.s. converges to Φ. The set

$$\{(x,\omega) \,:\, \lim_n \Phi_n(\tau_x\omega) = \Phi(\tau_x\omega)\,,\, |\Phi_n(\tau_x\omega)| \le \kappa \text{ for any } n\},$$

is clearly measurable with respect to the product σ–algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n) \otimes \mathcal{F}$, and so the almost sure convergence of Φ_n to Φ and the boundedness assumption on Φ_n imply that its x–sections have probability 1 for any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. We derive from Fubini's Theorem that there exists a set Ω' of probability 1 such that, if $\omega \in \Omega'$

$$\Phi_n(\tau_x\omega) \to \Phi(\tau_x\omega), \quad \sup_n |\Phi_n(\tau_x\omega)| \le \kappa \qquad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{24}$$

The set

$$X(\omega) = \{x \,:\, \Phi_n(\tau_x\omega) \to \Phi(\tau_x\omega), \quad \sup_n |\Phi_n(\tau_x\omega)| \le \kappa\}$$

is accordingly a stationary random set with volume fraction 1. Therefore, given a piecewise C^1 curve γ, by applying the Robin's Theorem with μ equal to $\mathcal{H}^1$ restricted to γ, we see that $\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma \setminus X(\omega)) = 0$ for ω belonging to some subset of Ω of probability 1. For such an ω the claimed convergence on γ holds true thanks to the Dominated Convergence Theorem. □

We proceed by giving a closer look to the differentiability properties of Lipschitz random function with stationary increments.

Proposition A.4. *Let v be a Lipschitz random function with stationary increments. Then there exists $\Phi \in (L^\infty(\Omega))^N$ such that:*

(i) for every ω in a set of probability 1

$$Dv(x,\omega) = \Phi(\tau_x\omega) \quad \textit{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N; \tag{25}$$

(ii) for every closed piecewise C^1 curve γ

$$\int_\gamma \Phi(\omega) = 0 \qquad \textit{a.s. in } \omega.$$

In addition, the equality (25) holds, for any *fixed x, a.s. in ω.*

Proof. Let κ be a positive constant such that $v(\cdot,\omega)$ is κ–Lipschitz for every ω. For each $i \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$ we define

$$w_i(x,\omega) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \inf_{h \in \mathbb{Q}\cap B_{1/n}} \frac{v(x + h\, e_i, \omega) - v(x,\omega)}{h}.$$

Such function is jointly measurable in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$, satisfies $|w_i(x,\omega)| \leq \kappa$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, and, in addition, it is stationary, being v with stationary increments. By (1), there exists a set Ω' of probability 1 such that

$$w_i(x,\omega) = w_i(0, \tau_x \omega) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and any } \omega \in \Omega'.$$

Moreover, for every $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$w_i(x,\omega) = \partial_{x_i} v(x,\omega) \quad \text{for every } x \in \Delta_v(\omega).$$

Since $\Delta_v(\omega)$ has full measure in $\mathbb{R}^N$ by the Lipschitz character of $v(\cdot,\omega)$, the equality (25) is obtained by setting $\Phi_i(\cdot) = w_i(0,\cdot)$.

For any $\omega \in \Omega$ we set

$$X(\omega) = \{x \in \Delta_v(\omega) \,:\, Dv(x,\omega) = \Phi(\tau_x \omega)\}.$$

By taking into account that Δ_v is a stationary random set (cf. Proposition 3.5) and that v has stationary increments, we see that X is a random stationary set. Furthermore, from (25) we deduce that its volume fraction is 1. By Fubini's Theorem, we deduce that for any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ the equality (25) holds a.s. in ω.

Given a piecewise C^1 closed curve $\gamma : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^N$, we invoke Robbins' Theorem with μ equal to $\mathcal{H}^1$ restricted to γ to deduce that $\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma \setminus X(\omega)) = 0$ for ω belonging to some subset of Ω with probability 1. For such an ω we get

$$\int_\gamma \Phi(\omega) = \int_0^T \langle Dv(\gamma(t),\omega), \dot\gamma(t)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t = v(\gamma(T),\omega) - v(\gamma(0),\omega)$$

and the assertion follows as $\gamma(T) = \gamma(0)$. □

Conversely, we have

Proposition A.5. *Let* $\Phi \in (L^\infty(\Omega))^N$ *with*

$$\int_\gamma \Phi(\omega) = 0 \qquad \text{a.s. in } \omega$$

for every closed piecewise C^1 *curve. Then there exist a Lipschitz random function* v *with stationary increments and a set* Ω_0 *of probability* 1 *such that, for any* $\omega \in \Omega_0$,

$$Dv(x,\omega) = \Phi(\tau_x \omega) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Proof. Let us set

$$v(x,\omega) = \int_0^1 \langle \Phi(\tau_{tx}\,\omega), x\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t, \qquad (x,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega.$$

Note that v is jointly measurable in (x,ω). By assumption we also have that, for every fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$v(x,\omega) = \int_0^T \langle \Phi(\tau_{\gamma(t)}\,\omega), \dot\gamma(t)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t, \qquad \text{a.s. in } \omega \tag{26}$$

whenever γ is a piecewise C^1 curve, defined in some interval $[0,T]$, joining 0 to x. For every $i = 1, \cdots, N$ we derive from (26)

$$\frac{v(x + h\,e_i,\omega) - v(x,\omega)}{h} = \int_0^1 \Phi_i(\tau_{x+t\,h\,e_i}\,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}t \qquad \text{for any } x, \text{ a.s. in } \omega,$$

where h is a discrete positive parameter. Hence

$$\int_\Omega \left| \frac{v(x+h\,e_i,\omega)-v(x,\omega)}{h} - \Phi_i(\tau_x\omega) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P} = \int_\Omega \left| \int_0^1 \Phi_i(\tau_{x+t\,h\,e_i}\,\omega) - \Phi_i(\tau_x\omega)\,\mathrm{d}t \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}$$

$$\leq \int_\Omega \int_0^1 |\Phi(\tau_{x+t\,h\,e_i}\,\omega) - \Phi(\tau_x\omega)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P} = \int_0^1 \|U_{t\,h\,e_i}\Phi - \Phi\|^2_{(L^2(\Omega))^N}\,\mathrm{d}t,$$

where in the last equality we have used Fubini's Theorem and the fact that the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ is invariant under τ_x. The previous relation implies, by the strong continuity of the group $(U_y)_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N}$

$$\frac{v(x+h\,e_i,\omega)-v(x,\omega)}{h} \underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} \Phi_i(\tau_x\omega) \qquad \text{in } L^2(\Omega),$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$; accordingly, thanks to Fubini's Theorem

$$\frac{v(x+h\,e_i,\omega)-v(x,\omega)}{h} \underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} \Phi_i(\tau_x\omega) \qquad \text{in } L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N),$$

a.s. in ω. This is, in turn, equivalent to the equality $\partial_{x_i} v(x,\omega) = \Phi_i(\tau_x\omega)$, for $i = 1,\cdots,N$, in the sense of distributions, a.s. in ω. Therefore, being Φ essentially bounded, $v(\cdot,\omega)$ is Lipschitz–continuous with $Dv(x,\omega) = \Phi(\tau_x\omega)$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and every ω in a set Ω_0 of probability 1. By suitably assigning the value of $v(\cdot,\omega)$ on $\Omega \setminus \Omega_0$, we extend the Lipschitz character of such function to all ω. Therefore v, being also jointly measurable in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega$, is a Lipschitz random function, as asserted.

It is left to show that it has stationary increments. Let us fix $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Then, by (26), for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$

$$\begin{aligned} v(x+z,\omega) \;-\; v(y+z,\omega) &= \int_0^1 \langle \Phi(\tau_{tx+(1-t)y+z}\,\omega), x-y\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t \qquad (27)\\ &= \int_0^1 \langle \Phi(\tau_{tx+(1-t)y}(\tau_z\,\omega)), x-y\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t = v(x,\tau_z\omega) - v(y,\tau_z\omega). \end{aligned}$$

for every ω in a set $\Omega_{x,y}$ of probability 1. Such a set does not depend only on z, as required to prove the claim, but also on x and y. To overcome this difficulty, we set

$$\Omega_z = \Omega_0 \cap \left(\bigcap_{x,y\in\mathbb{Q}^N} \Omega_{x,y} \right).$$

Clearly $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_z) = 1$, and by the continuity of $v(\cdot,\omega)$ we derive that, for any $\omega \in \Omega_z$, the equality (27) now holds for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, as required. This ends the proof. □

We make use of the results presented above to prove Theorems 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9.

Proof of Theorem 3.6. The scheme of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.8 in [11]. We denote by Φ_n the functions of $(L^\infty(\Omega))^N$ associated to v_n through Proposition A.4. Since the Φ_n are bounded in $(L^2(\Omega))^N$, a sequence made up by finite convex combinations of them, say $\Psi_k = \sum_{n\geq n_k} \lambda^k_n \Phi_n$, converges to some Φ in $(L^2(\Omega))^N$. By Lemma A.2, up to extraction of a subsequence

$$\int_\gamma \Psi_k(\omega) \to \int_\gamma \Phi(\omega) \quad \text{a.s. in } \omega, \qquad (28)$$

for any piecewise C^1 curve γ. This implies, in particular, $\int_\gamma \Phi(\omega) = 0$ a.s. in ω for any closed curve γ. We can thus associate to Φ a Lipschitz random function v with stationary increments using Proposition A.5, and we can further assume $v(0,\omega) = 0$ a.s. in ω. Let w_k be a sequence of Lipschitz random functions with stationary increments defined as in the statement and set $g_k(\omega) = -w_k(0,\omega)$. Given a point x and a piecewise C^1 curve γ connecting 0 to x, we have, a.s. in ω,

$$\begin{aligned} w_k(x,\omega) + g_k(\omega) &= \int_\gamma \Psi_k(\omega) \quad \text{for any } k \in \mathbb{N} \\ v(x,\omega) &= \int_\gamma \Phi(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $w_k(\cdot,\omega) + g_k(\omega)$ converges pointwise to $v(\cdot,\omega)$ a.s. in ω, by (28). By construction, the sequence $w_k(\cdot,\omega)+g_k(\omega)$ is almost surely equiLipschitz–continuous and locally equibounded. By Ascoli Theorem, it must indeed locally uniformly converge to $v(\cdot,\omega)$ a.s. in ω, as it was to be proved. □

Proof of Theorem 3.8. Let κ be a Lipschitz constant for $v(\cdot,\omega)$ for every ω. We start by proving the sublinearity property assuming the gradient to have vanishing mean. The first step is to show the existence of a set Ω' of probability 1 such that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{v(tx,\omega)}{t} = 0 \qquad \text{for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and } \omega \in \Omega'. \tag{29}$$

We fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and denote by $\Phi \in (L^\infty(\Omega))^N$ the function associated with v through Proposition A.4. Then

$$\frac{v(tx,\omega) - v(0,\omega)}{t} = \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \langle \Phi(\tau_{sx}\,\omega), x\rangle \,\mathrm{d}s \qquad \text{for every } t > 0,$$

a.s. in ω. By applying Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem to the function $\omega \mapsto \langle \Phi(\omega), x\rangle$ and the dynamical system $(\tau_{sx})_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$, we get that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{v(tx,\omega) - v(0,\omega)}{t}$$

does exist a.s. in ω and is almost surely equal to some measurable function $k(\omega)$. It is easy to see that, for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $k(\tau_z\omega) = k(\omega)$ a.s. in ω. Indeed,

$$\frac{v(tx,\tau_z\omega) - v(0,\tau_z\omega)}{t} = \frac{v(tx+z,\omega) - v(z,\omega)}{t} \qquad \text{a.s. in } \omega$$

for v has stationary increments, and

$$\left| \frac{v(tx+z,\omega) - v(z,\omega)}{t} - \frac{v(tx,\omega) - v(0,\omega)}{t} \right| \le \frac{2\,\kappa|z|}{t}.$$

By ergodicity, we derive that $k(\cdot)$ is a.s. constant, say equal to some $k \in \mathbb{R}$. Using the Dominated Convergence Theorem we infer

$$k = \lim_{t\to+\infty} \int_\Omega \frac{v(tx,\omega) - v(0,\omega)}{t}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \lim_{t\to+\infty} \int_\Omega \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \langle \Phi(\tau_{sx}\,\omega), x\rangle \,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(\omega).$$

By exploiting the fact that $\mathbb{P}$ is invariant with respect to the translations τ_y, we get

$$\int_\Omega \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \langle \Phi(\tau_{sx}\,\omega), x\rangle \,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t\int_\Omega \langle \Phi(\tau_{sx}\,\omega), x\rangle \,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s = \langle \mathbb{E}(\Phi), x\rangle,$$

and the limit relation in (29) follows for $\mathbb{E}(\Phi) = 0$ by hypothesis, at least for some set Ω_x of probability 1 depending on x. We then exploit the Lipschitz character of v to see that (29) holds with $\Omega' = \cap_{x \in \mathbb{Q}^N} \Omega_x$. We pick $\omega \in \Omega'$; the family of functions $y \mapsto \frac{v(ty,\omega)}{t}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, are equibounded and equiLipschitz continuous, for y varying in ∂B_1, and so it uniformly converges to 0, as $t \to +\infty$, by Ascoli Theorem and (29). Accordingly, given $\varepsilon > 0$, we find

$$\frac{|u(x)|}{|x|} = \frac{|u(|x|\frac{x}{|x|})|}{|x|} < \varepsilon$$

for $|x|$ large enough, as claimed.

We proceed to prove the converse implication. By Birkhoff Theorem we can find an ω for which the convergence (3) takes place and

$$\mathbb{E}(\Phi_1) = \lim_{R \to +\infty} \fint_{[-R,R]^N} \partial_{x_1} v(x,\omega)\, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Let us denote a point x in $\mathbb{R}^N$ by $(x_1, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \fint_{[-R,R]^N} \partial_{x_1} v(x,\omega)\, \mathrm{d}x \right| &= \left| \fint_{[-R,R]^{N-1}} \left(\fint_{-R}^{R} \partial_{x_1} v(x_1, y, \omega)\, \mathrm{d}x_1 \right) \mathrm{d}y \right| \\ &= \left| \fint_{[-R,R]^{N-1}} \left(\frac{v(R,y,\omega) - v(-R,y,\omega)}{R} \right) \mathrm{d}y \right| \leq 2 \max_{[-R,R]^N} \frac{|v(x,\omega)|}{R}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\mathbb{E}(\Phi_1) = 0$ in force of the assumption. Similarly we show that $\mathbb{E}(\Phi_i)$ vanishes for any $i = 2, \cdots N$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.9. Let us fix x, y in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and denote by γ the segment $ty + (1-t)x$, $t \in [0,1]$, and by Q the vector $\mathbb{E}(\Phi)$, where Φ is the function of $(L^\infty(\Omega))^N$ associated with v through Proposition A.4. Using Robin's Theorem, as in Proposition A.4, we get

$$v(y,\omega) - v(x,\omega) = \int_0^1 \langle \Phi(\tau_{\gamma(t)}\omega), y - x \rangle\, \mathrm{d}t \quad \text{a.s. in } \omega,$$

and by integrating on Ω

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(v(y,\cdot) - v(x,\cdot)) &= \int_\Omega \left(\int_0^1 \langle \Phi(\tau_{\gamma(t)}\omega), y - x \rangle\, \mathrm{d}t \right) \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P} \qquad (30) \\ &= \int_0^1 \langle \int_\Omega \Phi(\tau_{\gamma(t)}\omega)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}, y - x \rangle\, \mathrm{d}t = \langle Q, y - x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if v has gradient with vanishing mean , i.e. if $Q = 0$, then (4) follows, conversely, if (4) holds, then it is enough to take $y - x = Q$ in (30) to get $Q = 0$. □

References

[1] M. Bardi, I. Capuzzo Dolcetta, Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equations. With appendices by Maurizio Falcone and Pierpaolo Soravia. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1997.

[2] G. Barles, Solutions de viscositè des équations de Hamilton–Jacobi. Mathématiques & Applications, 17. Springer–Verlag, Paris, 1994.

[3] D. Burago, Y. Burago, S. Ivanov, A course in Metric Geometry. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. 33. AMS, Providence, 2001.

[4] G. Buttazzo, M. Giaquinta, S. Hildebrandt, One–dimensional variational problems. An introduction. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, **15**. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.

[5] F. Camilli, A. Siconolfi, Effective Hamiltonian and homogenization of measurable Eikonal equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **183** (2007), no. 1, 1–20.

[6] G. Castaing, M. Valadier, Convex Analysis and Measurable Multifunctions. Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1977.

[7] F.H. Clarke, Optimization and nonsmooth analysis. Wiley, New York, 1983.

[8] G. Contreras, R. Iturriaga, Global Minimizers of Autonomous Lagrangians. 22nd Brazilian Mathematics Colloquium, IMPA, Rio de Janeiro, 1999.

[9] A. Davini, Bolza Problems with discontinuous Lagrangians and Lipschitz continuity of the value function. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **46** (2007), no. 5, 1897–1921.

[10] A. Davini, A. Siconolfi, A generalized dynamical approach to the large time behavior of solutions of Hamilton–Jacobi equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, Vol. 38, no. 2 (2006), 478–502.

[11] A. Davini, A. Siconolfi, Exact and approximate correctors for stochastic Hamiltonians: the 1–dimensional case, *Preprint* (2008) (available at `http://cvgmt.sns.it/cgi/get.cgi/papers/davsic08/`).

[12] A. Davini, A. Siconolfi, On a random analog of Aubry–Mather Theory for stationary ergodic Hamiltonians. Preprint (2008).

[13] L.C. Evans, The perturbed test function method for viscosity solutions of nonlinear PDE. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **111** (1989), no. 3-4, 359–375.

[14] L.C. Evans, Periodic homogenisation of certain fully nonlinear partial differential equations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **120** (1992), no. 3-4, 245–265.

[15] A. Fathi, A. Figalli, Optimal transportation on non compact manifolds. *Israel J. Math.*, to appear.

[16] A. Fathi, E. Maderna, Weak KAM theorem on non compact manifolds. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* **14** (2007), no. 1-2, 1–27.

[17] A. Fathi, A. Siconolfi, PDE aspects of Aubry–Mather theory for continuous convex Hamiltonians. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **22**, no. 2 (2005) 185–228.

[18] V.V. Jikov, S.M. Kozlov, O.A. Oleinik, Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals. Translated from the Russian by G.A. Yosifian. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.

[19] P. L. Lions, Generalized solutions of Hamilton Jacobi equations. Research Notes in Mathematics, 69. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, Mass.-London, 1982.

[20] P.L. Lions, P.E. Souganidis, Correctors for the homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in the stationary ergodic setting. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **56** (2003), no. 10, 1501–1524.

[21] I. Molchanov, Theory of random sets. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2005.

[22] F. Rezakhanlou, J. E. Tarver, Homogenization for stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **151** (2000), no. 4, 277–309.

[23] P.E. Souganidis, Stochastic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations and some applications. *Asymptot. Anal.* **20** (1999), no. 1, 1–11.

[24] P.E. Souganidis, personal communication.

Dip. di Matematica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza", P.le Aldo Moro 2, 00185 Roma, Italy
E-mail address: `davini@mat.uniroma1.it, siconolf@mat.uniroma1.it`